

Vol. XXIX.

OCTOBER, 1952.

No. 4.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. A. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—V. Rev. J. Tevington, O.S.A., P.P., Innisfail, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Editor:

V.Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 283

Instruction of Holy Office on Sacred Art—Warning of Holy Office about writings on conjugal life—Condemnation of books—Responses of commission for the authentic interpretation of the canons of the Code.

THE PROBLEM OF CONCUPISCENCE:

A RECENT THEORY OF PROFESSOR KARL RAHNER,

Rev. John Kenny, S.J. 290

BISHOP WILLSON, XIII,

Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 305

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 317

The Theology of the Mass, IX.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 329

Absolution of the Dying and purpose of amendment—Co-operation in religious services.

CANON LAW .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, D.C.L. 337

Parish Priest in two dioceses—Dispensation from Mixed Religion and obligation to children already born—Suspension 'latae sententiae' attached to a precept—Occasional confessors of religious women—Place of hearing religious women's confessions.

LITURGY .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 344

Privileged Altar—Necessity of beeswax candles—Additions to the Roman Martyrology.

HOMILETICS .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 350

The Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree.

NOTES .. 353

Eucharistica.

BOOK REVIEWS .. 358

The Thomistic Concept of Justifying Contrition (Meyer); *Manuale Philosophiae*, III. IV (Di Napoli); *Philosophical Studies*; *Faith and Morals* (Fleming); *Father Thurston* (Crehan); *Beyond East and West* (Wu); *Christ in the Home* (Plus); *Praying While You Work* (Van Zeller); *St. Patrick's Summer* (Hunt); *If I Be Lifted Up* (Lane); *The Faith of Millions* (O'Brien); *Each Hour Remains*; *We Sing While There's Voice Left* (Van Zeller); *Blessed Placide Viel* [p. 304]; *St. Joseph's Parish, Temuka* (Cahill) [p. 316]; *Prayer in Faith* (Stuart); *Poems* (Stuart) [p. 336].

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOLUME XXIX .. 373

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Octobris, 1952.

Official Documents

SUPREME S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

*Instruction
to local Ordinaries on "Sacred Art"*

As the name itself implies, the function and purpose of sacred art is to contribute in the best possible manner to the beauty of the house of God. It should foster faith and piety in those who gather within the temple to assist at the divine offices and to implore the favours of heaven. For this reason sacred art has always been the object of assiduous care and vigilant attention on the part of the Church. She desires that it faithfully follow her laws, dictated as these are by revealed doctrine and right asceticism! Thus only can it deserve the name of Sacred Art.

To sacred art the words apply which Pius X wrote of sacred music in the wise rules which he promulgated for that art: "There should be nothing in the temple to disturb or even diminish the piety and devotion of the faithful, nothing which would give them reasonable motive for displeasure or scandal, nothing above all—that would be unworthy of the house of prayer and the majesty of God".

Therefore, from the earlier ages of the Church, the Second Council of Nicea, in condemning the heresy of the iconcolasts, confirmed the veneration of sacred images and at the same time threatened with severe penalties those who dared to introduce improper fancies contrary to the ecclesiastical constitutions.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th Session, having set down prudent laws for Christian iconography, concluded a grave exhortation on this subject to the Bishops in the following words: "Let episcopal diligence and care in this matter be such that nothing inordinate, nothing preposterous or boisterous, nothing profane, nothing unbecoming shows itself in the Churches, since holiness is what becomes the house of God".

Urban VIII also, in prescribing special norms which were calculated to secure the exact observance of the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, thus expresses himself: "What is set before the eyes of the faithful should not be inordinate or unusual, but should excite devotion and piety".

Lastly, the Code of Canon Law gathers and co-ordinates the chief

heads of the Church's legislation on sacred art into the canons 485, 1160, 1178, 1261, 1268, 1269 § 1, 1279, 1280, 1385, 1399).

Special mention should be made of what canon 1261 prescribes. This canon lays the obligation on local Ordinaries to take vigilant care, especially in regard to divine worship—that nothing be admitted which is foreign to the faith or away from ecclesiastical tradition; and canon 1279 § 12 declares that the law forbids images, however they may be imprinted, if they are contrary to the sense and decrees of the Church.

In recent times also the Apostolic See has condemned deviations and contaminations of the form of sacred art. What is objected by some, namely, that sacred art ought to adapt itself to the necessities and conditions of new times, has no real weight; for sacred art, having originated with Christian society, has its own purposes, from which it can never depart, and its own function, to which it must constantly hold. Therefore Pius XI, of venerable memory, when inaugurating the new Picture Gallery of the Vatican, after having made mention of a so-called "new art", added these grave words: "We have already expressed Ourselves in this matter. To men of art and to the Pastors of the Church We have said: "Our hope, Our ardent desire, Our will can be nothing else than this, that canon law, clearly formulated and sanctioned in the Code, be obeyed, that is to say: that such art be not admitted into our churches, and even more so that it not be called in to construct them, to transform them, to decorate them. At the same time let every door be opened, and generous welcome be given to every good and progressive development of those good and venerable traditions, which in so many centuries of Christian life, in such great diversity of environments and of social and ethnic conditions, have given such great proof of inexhaustible capacity to inspire new and beautiful forms as often as they were interrogated or studied and cultivated under the twofold light of genius and faith".

More latterly still, Pius XII, now happily reigning, in the Encyclical on the Liturgy (20 Nov., 1947), clearly and concisely described the functions of sacred art: It is absolutely necessary, His Holiness said, to give a free field to that modern art which serves with due reverence and due honour to beautify our sacred edifices and our sacred rites. It is only reasonable that present-day art should also unite its voice with that wonderful concert of glory which men of supreme genius have sung to the Catholic faith throughout the centuries gone by. However, We cannot fail to satisfy a conscientious duty imposed on Us by Our office,

in deploring and condemning what seem to be deformations and depravations of sane art, things which are sometimes openly repugnant to Christian decorum and modesty and piety, and which miserably offend genuine religious feeling. These must absolutely be kept away from our churches and put out of them, as in general whatever does not harmonize with the holiness of the sacred place. (Can. 1198).

All these things having been attentively considered, this Supreme Sacred Congregation, in its solicitude for the maintenance of faith and piety in the Christian people through the contribution of sacred art to that objective, has judged it necessary to recall the following directives to the Ordinaries of the whole world, so that sacred art may follow the forms and modes which are in harmony with the decorum and holiness of the house of God:

On architecture. Sacred architecture, even if it assumes new forms, must never be just like that of secular edifices, but must always fulfil its own proper function. The sacred edifice must be the house of God and a house of prayer. By all means, let the convenience of the faithful be consulted in the construction of new churches—convenience which will enable them to follow with more easy attention of eye and soul the details of the sacred ceremonies; let new churches also be distinguished by a beautiful simplicity of lines not broken by deceptive adornments; but at the same time let everything be avoided which would reveal artistic negligence”.

In canon 1162 § 1 we find the rule: “No church can be built without the express consent in writing of the local Ordinary, which consent the Vicar General cannot give without special authorization”.

Canon 1164 § 1 has: “Ordinaries shall take care, hearing, if necessary, the opinion of experts, that in the building or repairing of churches, the forms received from Christian tradition and the laws of sacred art be observed”.

Besides, this Supreme Sacred Congregation insists once more on the exact observance of cc. 1268 § 2 and 1269 § 1: “The Holy Eucharist should be kept in the most conspicuous and noblest place of the church, and, in consequence, the normal place is the high altar, unless another altar seems to be more fitting and more convenient for the veneration and worship of this great Sacrament . . . The Holy Eucharist should be kept in an immovable tabernacle placed in the centre of the altar”.

On figurative art. “In accordance with canon 1279, no one is

allowed, without the previous approbation of the local Ordinary, to place or have placed in churches (even exempt churches) or in other sacred edifices, any unusual image" § 1.

"The Ordinary must not approve for public exposition to the veneration of the faithful images that are not in accordance with the approved use of the Church" § 2.

"The Ordinary must never permit the setting up, in churches or sacred buildings, of images which convey false doctrine, or which offend modesty and decorum, or which could lead uninstructed persons into dangerous errors" § 3.

In case experts are wanting in diocesan Commissions, or in case doubts or controversies arise, let the local Ordinaries consult the Metropolitan Commission or the Roman Commission of Sacred Art.

According to the requirements of cc. 485 and 1178, let the Ordinaries have removed from sacred edifices all those things which are in any way repugnant to the sanctity of the place and to the reverence due to the house of God; let them also severely forbid the inept and absurd setting forth for the veneration of the faithful, either on the altars or on chapel walls, of a confused multitude of statues or images of mediocre artistic value, mostly stereotyped.

Let Bishops and Religious Superiors refuse permission to publish books, periodicals or leaves carrying imprinted images which are foreign to the sense and decrees of the Church (cc. 1385 and 1399 § 12).

So that the local Ordinaries may be able to ask and find from the Diocesan Commission of Sacred Art advice which is in keeping with the rulings of the Apostolic See and with the purpose of sacred art, let them see that the persons elected to this College are not only of proved competence in the domain of art, but possess also strong Christian faith, have a true sense of piety, and give willing adherence to the directives of ecclesiastical authority.

Both in architecture and sculpture and painting let preference be given to those artists only who possess the best professional skill and who are able, moreover, to make their work an expression of sincere faith and piety, for this is the proper purpose of Sacred Art.

Finally, provision must be made that those aspiring to sacred orders in Philosophical and Theological Schools, be instructed according to their age and capacity in sacred art and formed to a right understanding

of it by masters who respect the venerable traditions of our fathers and follow the directions of the Holy See.

Given at Rome from the Palace of the Holy Office, 30th June, 1952.

+ J. Card. PIZZARDO, *Secretary*.

Alfred Ottaviani, *Assessor*.

*

*

*

*

MONITUM SANCTI OFFICII

Gravi cum sollicitudine Apostolica Sedes animadvertit non paucos scriptores his ultimis temporibus, de vita coniugali agentes, passim palam et minute ad singula eam spectantia invereconde descendere; praeterea nonnullos actum quemdam, *amplexum reservatum* nuncupatum, describere, laudare et suadere.

Ne in re tanti momenti, quae matrimonii sanctitatem et animorum salutem respicit, munere suo deficiat, Superma Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, de expresso mandato SSmi D.N.D. Pii, divina Providentia Pp. XII, omnes praedictos scriptores graviter monet, ut ab huiusmodi agendi ratione desistant. Sacros quoque Pastores enixe hortatur ut in his rebus sedulo advigilent et quae opportuna sint remedia sollicite apponant.

Sacerdotes autem, in cura animarum et in conscientiis dirigendis numquam, sive sponte sive interrogati, ita loqui praesumant quasi ex parte legis christianae contra "*amplexum reservatum*" nihil esset obiiciendum.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 30 Junii, 1952.

Marinus Marani, S.S.C.S.O., *Notarius*.

*

*

*

*

Condemnation of Books

By a Decree of May 20, 1952, the Holy Office condemned and put on the Index all the works of Albert Pincherle. The Sacred Congregation also took the occasion offered by this condemnatory act to deplore the harm done to souls by the torrent of lascivious publications offered to the reading public and the eagerness with which they are read. The Sacred Congregation reminds all the faithful of the grave obligation of abstaining from such reading, reminds educators of the duty of keeping their young charges away from such poison, and reminds civil authorities of their obligations in regard to writings of this kind, which are calculated to destroy the very principles and foundations of natural morality.

By Decree of April 2, 1952, the same Holy Office condemned and put on the Index all the works of André Gide.

On the following 28 May, 1952, two books on the life of the Blessed Virgin were condemned and put on the Index. The first was *La Mère, Vie de Marie*, of Robert Morel, and the second the German translation of the same work entitled *Das Leben Marias* (Olten, Walter).

*

*

*

*

Pontifical Commission for the authentic interpretation of the Canons of the Code.

Responses to Queries.

The Eminent Fathers of the Commission for the authentic interpretation of the canons of the Code, assembled in plenary session, ordered the following answers to be given to doubts set before them:

I. *On dispensation from matrimonial impediments.*

Query: Whether the words of canon 1953 "*facta permissio transitus ad alias nuptias*" are to be understood only of permission given by the Apostolic See, or also of permission given by the local Ordinary.

Response: *No* to the first part; *Yes* to the second.

II. *On the interpretation of canon 598 § 2.*

Query 1: Whether the wives of the Governors of each one of Federated States with their suite may be admitted within the enclosure of men of a regular Order or Congregation, according to canon 598 § 2.

Response: *Yes*.

Query 2: Whether the interpretation given in Response 1 is declaratory or extensive.

Response: *No* to the first part; *Yes* to the second.

III. *On the age of those for confirmation.*

Query: Whether, in view of canon 788, a mandate of the local Ordinary may be upheld forbidding the administration of confirmation to children who have not attained the age of ten years.

Response: *No*.

IV. *On the place for assisting at Mass in order to satisfy the law of hearing Mass.*

Query: Whether, notwithstanding the rule laid down in Canon 1249, the law of hearing Mass is satisfied by one who assists at Mass in a place, as mentioned in Canon 822 § 4.

Response: *Yes*.

V. *On the interpretation of Canon 209.*

Query: Whether the ruling of Canon 209 is to be applied in the case of a priest, who, without being delegated, assists at a marriage.

Response: *Yes*.

VI. *On the application of the rulings of Canons 197, 199, 206-209, to potestas dominativa.*

Query: Whether the rulings of Canons 197, 188, 206-209 are to be applied, unless the nature of the thing or the text or context of the law stand in the way, to the potestas dominativa, which Superiors and Chapters have in Religions and in Societies of men or women living in common without public vows.

Response: *Yes*.

Given at Rome, from the Vatican City, the 26th of March, 1952.

M. Card. MASSIMI, *President*.

A. Coussa, Bas. Alepp., *Secretary*.

W. LEONARD.

The Problem of Concupiscence: A Recent Theory of Professor Karl Rahner

Summary: Introduction.

Part 1: Preliminary Observations:

- (1) The preacher's and the theologian's approach to concupiscence.
- (2) Concupiscence is not exclusively towards evil, nor (3) exclusively sensory. (4) Integrity, as a preternatural gift, must be safeguarded.

Part 2: Positive Considerations:

1. The Mechanics of Freedom:—A) a prerequisite of the free act;
B) the mechanics of the perfectly free act itself:—
 - (1) man sets himself before God;
 - (2) in my free act I decide about MYSELF;
 - (3) how the free act may achieve more or less self-mastery.
2. Dualism of 'nature' and 'person'; metaphysical basis for this dualism.

Introduction.

In St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, there is a passage of poignant and piercing self-revelation:—

"...I am carnal, sold into the power of sin. For I understand not mine own actions: what I wish I perform not, but what I hate I do. Now if what I do is contrary to my wish, I am admitting that the Law is excellent. In fact, it is no longer I that act, but sin dwelling within me. For I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is, in my flesh, what is good; to wish is within my reach, but to accomplish what is excellent, no. I do not the good that I wish; but the evil that I do not wish, that I perform. Now if I do what I wish not, it is no longer I that act, but sin dwelling within me. I find, then, his law when I wish to do what is excellent, namely, that what is evil lieth to my hand. I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I behold another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and making me captive to the law of sin which is in my members. Unhappy man that I am! Who will deliver me from the body of this death?"¹

These words, all the more arresting because coming from the pen of a man of heroic sanctity, portray in Paul's inimitable style of white-hot sincerity that factor in human life known as CONCUPISCENCE. It is a factor in normal human life; and every man reading Paul's words must say his 'yea' to them. Paul is describing what is simply stark reality.

When you find concupiscence so graphically presented and by a writer who drives his pen at the dictation of the Holy Ghost and who therefore gives you infallible truth, you may think that no room is left for further discussion. You may say to yourself: 'Concupiscence is a fact; it was in Paul; it is in me. My conscience bears witness to the truth of his words, which, anyhow, bear the hall-mark of absolute truth about them. The thing is clear. I cannot get away from it. That's the end of it'.

¹Romans, 7/14-25. Westminster Version.

However, though the fact of concupiscence is abundantly clear, that is not the end of it. Most emphatically there is room for discussion; for concupiscence presents one of the knottiest problems of dogmatic theology. If it is easy to assert THAT concupiscence *is*; it is by no means easy to say scientifically WHAT it is. To convince yourself of this, you need only reflect on the following two points:—

1. Your self-knowledge, the testimony of your conscience, forces you to the admission of the fact of concupiscence. But what do you know of its nature from self-knowledge? Your self-experience tells you about your moral weakness, your liability to sin, temptation, sinfulness. You perhaps associate those things with concupiscence. Yet concupiscence is not just those things. And the reason is simple: Adam, before his fall, before, therefore, he suffered concupiscence, was liable to sin, could be tempted and fall. Yet to concupiscence in its theological sense (the only sense that interests us here) belongs only what Adam lacked through his gift of integrity (that is, through that gift that freed him from concupiscence). You see that from mere self-examination it is not easy to disentangle what belongs to concupiscence properly so called from what belongs to man just as man, whether or not he is immune from concupiscence. It is true that we do have empirical experience of some facets of concupiscence; but it is also true that much of our knowledge of it rests on Revelation alone. And it is not easy at the outset to distinguish the various elements and to say in what precisely consists concupiscence in the theological sense.

2. Again, the traditional teaching on concupiscence seems to involve an antinomy. For according to this teaching, concupiscence seems to be at one and the same time something unnatural and something natural. It is *unnatural* for this reason: St. Paul, St. Augustine, the Council of Trent² (to mention only a few sources) represent concupiscence as something that can at least be called 'sin'. It is sin at least in the sense that it is both the daughter and mother of sin. Indeed there are passages in St. Augustine³ giving the impression that for him con-

²Session V, n. 5:—"Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus PECCATUM appellat, sancta Synodus declarat, Ecclesiam catholicam nunquam intellexisse, peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est ad peccatum inclinat." Denzinger 792.

³Father Boyer ("De Deo Creante et Elevante"; Rome; 1940; pg. 385ff.) to prove his thesis: "Peccatum Originale non consistit formaliter in concupiscentia..." appeals precisely to St. Augustine and produces some striking passages. However, there are others that seem to run in a different direction. Take, for example, the 'Contra Julianum' (Migne; Patres Latini; vol. XLIV). In this work, especially

cupiscence is sin in the strictest and fullest sense. At any rate, it is portrayed as an insupportable burden crushing down on man. Now something that is so overwhelming and in some sense 'sin' can hardly be natural to man, but, rather seems most unnatural.

On the other hand, Catholic teaching, particularly as crystallized in the Bull of Pope Saint Pius V, condemning the dogmatic vagaries of Michael du Bay⁴ emphatically asserts that Adam's freedom from concupiscence was a preternatural gift. The implication of such teaching is that concupiscence is *natural* to man, part and parcel of his being, unless he is released from it by some completely 'unowed', gratuitous gift.

Yes, concupiscence certainly presents the theologian with a thorny problem. The manuals of scholastic theology attempt solutions to its problem. Their treatments are perhaps not wholly satisfactory. It will, therefore, be worthwhile and interesting to examine a new theory of concupiscence. The theory that I propose here is not my own; it is the theory of Father Karl Rahner, S.J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the celebrated State University of Innsbruck, Austria. This theory Father Rahner has taught in his lectures and published in the University's highly-esteemed theological organ: "Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie".⁵

in the sixth book there are some emphatic statements that concupiscence is not formally sin: "qui baptizatur...omni peccato caret, non omni malo" (850-851); "Concupiscentiam vero quis ambigat in hac vita posse minui, non posse consumi? Horum itaque malorum praeteritus omnis REATUS sacro fonte diluitur..." (851). But against these statements are those recurring assertions that concupiscence is evil, recurring through five long books; it is hard not to gain the impression that Augustine considered it as moral evil, though in other assertions, such as those cited from book VI, qualifications and corrections are added. As witness to the impression that Augustine seems often to consider concupiscence as moral evil, recall how often in this work you meet such a phrase as this, that in marriage 'bene utitur libidinis MALO' (e.g. 709, where is added immediately: 'non sine malo, propter quod regenerandi sunt, ut liberentur a malo.' If 're-birth' is necessary, does it not look as though concupiscence deprives of grace?); "malo bene utentes in propagatione filiorum" (718, c. 16). Notice this passage: "Nam pudicitia conjugalitatem inhiantem concupiscentiam sive de illicito sive de licito percipere voluptatem, frenat ab illicito, permittit ad licitum: hoc est bonum, non tamen ejus, sed bene utentis bonum est. Quod autem ipsa concupiscentia facit, sive ad licitum sive ad illicitum indifferenter ardescere, utique malum est. Hoc itaque malo bene utitur pudicitia conjugalitatem, melius non utitur continentia virginalis" (739, n. 7). I suppose such a passage can be interpreted in the sense of PHYSICAL evil. But I do not find such an interpretation highly convincing.

⁴"Integritas primae creationis non fuit indebita humanae naturae exaltatio, sed naturalis eius conditio"—condemned proposition, from the Bull: 'Ex omnibus afflictionibus', 1 Oct., 1567; Denzinger, 1026. Cf. also Denzinger, 1516.

⁵"Zum theologischen Begriff der Konkupiscenz"; Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie; 1941; pgs. 61-81.

For various reasons it seems to me desirable to explain Professor Rahner's views. First, because whilst the theory of the current manuals is open to serious objections, I think Professor Rahner's view is untouched by these criticisms. Secondly, because an article in German (and in this case, very difficult German) is not always widely read by theologians in English-speaking communities. Thirdly because the number of "Zeitschrift" in which this article appears is extremely rare. The issue suffered severely from war conditions. Last year in Innsbruck the Editor of the Review spoke to me of letters from such important people as the Librarians of the Vatican Library and of the Harvard University Library begging him to send them this number. And he could oblige neither these eminent men nor many others who sought a copy. Finally, the high intrinsic merit of this theory, coupled with the fact that it is from Professor Rahner's pen (and *any* article of his is entitled to closest study, for he is, without any doubt, one of the foremost of living dogmatic theologians), push me to present this theory. I do not simply translate, but rather try to give in my own way Professor Rahner's fecund ideas.

What follows falls into four parts. The first is chiefly negative, indicating dangers or misconceptions to be shunned in building up a theory of concupiscence. The second part gives some of the positive qualities that must enter into your theory. The third part comes to close grips with Father Rahner's theory, defining the three senses of concupiscence and insisting on the meaning of the theological concept of concupiscence. The fourth part shows the developments of the theory, how it interprets the relation between concupiscence and morality, how it safeguards the naturalness of concupiscence, how it explains immunity from concupiscence in Adam.

Part 1. Preliminary Observations.

1. If a preacher or pastor of souls or moral theologian or ascetical writer treats of concupiscence, he will, quite rightly, insist on it in its relation to morality; that is to say, he will naturally stress how it can constitute an inclination and drag to evil. Speaking as a preacher or teacher of ascetics, he is concerned only with this aspect of concupiscence. But it would be hasty to conclude that *that* is the only aspect of concupiscence; that it is nothing but a drag and a nagging to evil. A dogmatic theologian, scientifically scrutinizing the concept of concupiscence, must ask himself if in fact what preachers and spiritual writers say does give you a complete picture of concupiscence. You can realize

that here is a possible solution to the antimony mentioned above: St. Paul is not attempting to treat concupiscence scientifically. He is a preacher, an apostle. He is not interested to give an all-rounded scientific analysis of this concept. A similar remark might be made about St. Augustine. In his polemical writings (and it is in these that he treats of concupiscence) he notoriously tends to stress a particular aspect of his subject, which needs stressing, but about which an incautious reader might draw exaggerated conclusions. Likewise in other fields: as a preacher you put forward quite simply man's freedom, God's sovereign dominion and his helping graces. Your hearers might never suspect that there are dark mysteries here; and for the ordinary practice of Christian life it will not help them to know anything about 'concursum' and pre-motions. So in our matter. The preacher's or ascetical teacher's practical treatment of concupiscence is not necessarily that of the dogmatic theologian. You must be on your guard that the former treatment does not prejudice you against a scientific canvassing of the question.

2. A theory of concupiscence that starts off with the assumption that concupiscence manifests itself EXCLUSIVELY in a trend to what is morally forbidden can hardly be described as adequately scientific. As I have just said, the preacher or spiritual writer might legitimately fasten just on this aspect of concupiscence; not so the dogmatic theologian. He must realise that concupiscence belongs to the faculty of desire and that this faculty can as easily orientate itself on what is good as on what is evil. First and foremost to the faculty of desire belongs the character of spontaneity. This spontaneity is as much in evidence against an evil free decision as in favour of it. In other words, spontaneity, the faculty of desire and concupiscence are necessarily and essentially *bi-valent*.⁶ This observation will become clearer in the light of what is to be added later in this article. For the moment we can pass on.

3. A theory of concupiscence that regards concupiscence as an

⁶Professor Rahner urges that if you conceive of concupiscence only as a drive to evil, you are faced with a psychological impossibility in the gift of integrity. For such a gift must be either habitual or transient. If habitual, it would not be able to distinguish between drives to evil and drives to good, and when reason made that distinction, it would be too late. But an habitual gift that could suppress not only evil inclination, but also the healthy bent of nature against evil, would be, to say the least, a strange gift. On the other hand, if integrity is not habitual but only transient, you are cornered into a position very embarrassing to any metaphysician, of appealing to constant interventions from without, jamming on the brakes on concupiscence.

EXCLUSIVELY sensory phenomenon can hardly be described as adequately scientific. Assuredly your metaphysical psychology forces you to distinguish various really distinct faculties in man; in particular it forces you to draw a line of demarcation between the sensory faculty of desire and the spiritual. But these distinctions must be thought of prudently. No human faculty, even the most lofty, is a *thing*. In scholastic terminology, a faculty is never an '*ens quod*' but only an '*ens quo*'. Only the subject, the man, is an '*ens quod*', a *thing*. He acts *by* and *through* his different faculties. They all belong to him, are his, no matter how much they differ amongst themselves. There is one and the selfsame subject for all, to whom all is attributed. From his substance the different faculties spring and blossom forth; by it they are supported and held together in a unity.

Now the man, the subject who alone acts, is a composite being. The co-efficients of this composite being, his matter and spiritual form, are radical and essential, not just superficial and adventitious. And man's body is penetrated through and through by his soul, which '*per se*' and '*immediately*' informs the body and every part of it. Likewise, so long as man is on this earth, every single soul-action is necessarily and essentially conditioned by his body. Hence in him NEVER do you find an *exclusively* sensory activity; never an *exclusively* spiritual. But everything he does is sensory-spiritual or spiritual-sensory, though, of course, the mingling of the two elements will be in different ratios and intensities.

From this it follows that when man is faced with an object of the senses, he knows that object not in purely sensory fashion, but in a sensory-spiritual fashion. Similarly, when the object before him is utterly spiritual or '*intellectual*' in itself, he knows it in a spiritual-sensory way. There is always and inevitably the '*conversio ad phantasma*'. But what is true of the cognitive, is also true of the appetitive faculties. Just as a man knows in a spiritual-sensory style, in the same style he strives after or desires an object. If, therefore, there is a spontaneous sensory act of desire forestalling the deliberate act of desire, there is also a spontaneous spiritual act of striving anticipating the same deliberate act. The information of matter by the spiritual soul in man is continuous and all-pervading, just as, on the other hand, the presence of the material co-efficient is a continuous and all-pervading condition of the realization of any spiritual phenomenon in man. Thus in a man's actions, the spiritual is shot through with the sensory, and the sensory

with the spiritual. When, consequently, you have an act of concupiscence, a spontaneous desire, anticipating the free decision and persisting in the teeth of it, that is also partly spiritual. Hence concupiscence is as much at work in an importunate temptation to despair, disbelief (where the object is 'spiritual') as in the promptings of the flesh; and in both cases the man acts in a spiritual-sensory or sensory-spiritual fashion.

From this you can see that it is by no means clear that concupiscence should be qualified exclusively as lust, or as the insurrection of the ontologically lower in man against the ontologically higher. Quite often writers give you the impression that what is ontologically lower in man is 'eo ipso' also the ethically more dangerous and in that sense lower. The material component in us is further removed from the 'pure act' that is God; and for that reason it is ontologically lower than the spiritual co-efficient. But from this you must not conclude that the danger of rebellion against God springs only from what is ontologically lower in us. You must not conclude that the higher a being is in the metaphysical scale, the less it is in danger of turning away from God. In reality, there is as much risk of treachery against God in the Lucifer-loftiness of spirit as there is in the dark depths of the purely sensory.

4. Here it will not be out of place to take stock of a disastrous consequence of any theory of concupiscence that limits this exclusively to man's sensory half and regards this sensory half as exclusively dragging to evil. If that is your concept of concupiscence, then you cannot logically hold that the gift of integrity is preternatural. Why? Because if man has within him a quality that always and immediately and exclusively runs counter to the right moral order, that quality cannot be *natural*. Such a quality would be in diametrical opposition with man's finality. It is impossible that the almighty Creator, who declared all the works of his hands *good*, could so have constituted a being one of whose radical and essential elements pushes exclusively and always against that being's last end. Such a being would be in a state of radical contradiction. The hypothesis, therefore, that a being could be so created is false. Yet Catholic teaching insists that integrity is a gratuitous, a preternatural gift. The obvious implication of that insistence is that man *need not* have had this gift, that he could be created without that gift, for a purely gratuitous gift is in no sense 'owed' to nature. Hence concupiscence is 'natural' to man. Had man been created with concupiscence, in no sense would the goodness and wisdom of the Creator be

attain. At long last, then, the conclusion:—concupiscence must not be regarded as exclusively sensory and as exclusively dragging to evil.

Part 2. Positive Considerations.

In the foregoing part we have been clearing the ground for a positive concept of concupiscence. All that has been said leaned to the negative side; that is to say, we have indicated what one must guard against and shun in developing a theory of concupiscence.

We are still not ready to set forth the theory itself. Before doing that, we must discuss some points that are involved in this theory. But our discussion now takes on a constructive colour.

(1) The Mechanics of Freedom.

It is important to study at close hand something of the metaphysical mechanics (if I may so speak) of the perfectly free act. One's concept of concupiscence is necessarily conditioned by one's concept of freedom and its phenomenology. By way of introduction to what follows a word must first be said about a prerequisite of the adequately free act.

A) The free or deliberate act in man is essentially bound up with the spontaneous or indeliberate act of desire. In man the free faculty of striving or desire cannot issue into act unless there has preceded an 'unfree' or spontaneous act of the appetitive faculty. Why is this so? Human freedom, faced with an extrinsic object, is essentially finite. Our faculty of free decision is not from the start in possession of its object, it is not in act towards its object; there is always and necessarily a transit from potency to act before the free taking-up of position, before the free decision can issue into act. Before I can choose or reject deliberately a particular, external object, that object must be 'given' to my will, so that it can elicit its appropriate act. It must be 'given' to my will: it is by no means enough that it be given merely to my intellect as such. The object presented to the mind is presented passively; to the will, as an essentially active faculty, the object, too, must be presented actively. This is achieved by the spontaneous comportment of the desire-faculty, which reacts 'actively' so soon as an object is presented to the intellect. So soon as an object is made present to the intellect, the indeliberate desire-faculty, on the basis of the very dynamism of nature, reacts to that object, becomes conscious of that object. In this spontaneous reaction and behaviour of the indeliberate desire-potency you have the active 'giving' of an object to the will so that over it the will may make a decision. With metaphysical necessity, an object must be actively given to the will so that freedom may manifest itself and come

to birth; with that same metaphysical necessity the spontaneous or indeliberate act of desire must anticipate (logically at least, if not chronologically) the free decision.

An obvious consequence of these statements is that immunity from concupiscence (however we are going to explain it) cannot consist in the absence of all spontaneity and of all indeliberate acts. For the indeliberate acts form a pre-requisite to the deliberate. Spontaneity underlies human free decision; take that away, and you destroy human freedom.

Here again we remember that the spontaneous act of desire, which is a pre-requisite for freedom, is always either sensory-spiritual or spiritual-sensory, whether the object of its orientation be itself purely sensory or purely spiritual.

B) Now let us focus our attention on the mechanics of the free act itself. Man's free decision must be qualified in two directions:—

(1) First, man's free decision is an act whereby, explicitly or implicitly, he sets himself before God, the absolute Good, and determines himself in the eyes of God. Every free decision concerns God; in every free decision God is at least implicitly included in so far as he comes into the good in general; and an individual, limited good can be freely chosen or rejected only by virtue of man's dynamism towards the good in general. Hence, in every free decision, I make a decision about God; I determine how I shall stand before God. The attitude I freely adopt always implies a reference to God, the Infinite Good. The spontaneous, indeliberate act, on the other hand, is always directed towards a finite good (or towards a good represented as finite), for only such a good can present itself to the knowing-faculty and so summon into life the spontaneous act.

(2) A second consideration about the perfectly free and therefore thoroughly moral human act. In my free decision I want to, and try to, possess and master myself as wholly as possible. In ultimate analysis an act of human freedom is not precisely a decision about some extrinsic object. It is a decision about the autodetermining subject's self. As I have just shown, when I act freely I do not basically decide on my attitude to a finite good; rather I decided on my attitude to the absolute good and the absolute reality that is God. Because I can be free only by a dynamic orientation towards the infinite good (not towards a finite good) therefore every free act I posit is, not through a mere juridic and moralistic interpretation, but by reason of the sheer metaphysical

structure of such an act, a disposition of myself before God. Faced with a particular good, which is the matter of my choice, always, in some sense, at least implicitly, I refer this good to God, and thus, since I also refer this good to myself as appetible for me, I at the same time refer myself to God. Hence, in every free decision, I tend to dispose of myself as a whole and wholly. Every intellectual knowing and willing subject, in every objective act of knowledge and choice, necessarily accomplishes an introversion (*'reditio completa subiecti in seipsum'*). He is present to himself, self-conscious; and he decides about himself. In your free decision you are necessarily self-conscious, you necessarily mark yourself off from every other thing, and you really act; you are not just acted upon. And if you really act and are not just passively driven, your free decision springs from the very core of your personality; it is yours, your responsibility. It affects you, determines you, tends to dispose of you as fully as possible, because it flows from the very roots of your being and affects your whole being. Your free decision can be your responsibility only in so far as it is a determination of yourself and is a disposal about yourself. And as it arises from the very core of your being, it necessarily tends to dispose of you as far as that is possible.⁷

⁷For this important consideration, it will be well to cite Father Rahner's own words: "Die Freiheitsentscheidung des Menschen ist zweitens ein Akt, durch den der Mensch über sich als Ganzes verfügt. Denn die sittliche Freiheit ist ursprünglich und endlich nicht so sehr die Entscheidung über einen gegenständlich vorgestellten einzelnen Wertgegenstand, sondern eine solche über das frei handelnde Subjekt selbst. Denn der sittlich frei Handelnde entscheidet letztlich wegen des eben genannten ersten Aspektes des sittlichen Aktes nicht so sehr über seine Stellungnahme zu dem endlichen, vorgestellten Gut, sondern über seine Beziehung zur absoluten Wertwirklichkeit Gottes. Weil der Mensch nur in der dynamischen Ausgerichtetheit auf das unendliche Gut dem endlichen Gut gegenüber frei sein kann, darum ist jede Freiheitsentscheidung nicht nur durch eine juridische oder moralische Interpretation dieses Aktes, sondern auf Grund ihrer metaphysischen Struktur eine Verfügung des Menschen über seine Stellung zu Gott. Dabei hat die Freiheitsentscheidung die Tendenz über den Menschen als Ganzes zu verfügen. Denn das gerüstig erkennende und wollende Subjekt vollzieht bei jeder gegenständlichen Erkenntnis und Entscheidung immer auch notwendig eine Rückkunft seiner selbst zu sich..., ist sich so gegenwärtig und handelt als sich so Gegenwärtiges wirklich selbst. Die Freiheitshandlung als echte Handlung, die nicht bloss ein passives Widerfahrnis ist, entspringt so dem innersten Kern des Subjekts und wirkt auf diesen bestimmend ein. Denn andernfalls würde das handelnde Subjekt, insofern es mit diesem Person-Zentrum identisch ist, diese Freiheitsentscheidung nur passiv erdulden, nicht aber sie aktiv setzen. Das aber widerspricht dem innersten Wesen der Freiheitshandlung, insofern das handelnde Subjekt wirklich für sie verantwortlich ist. Verantwortlich aber kann das handelnde Subjekt selbst für die Freiheitsentscheidung nur dann sein und bleiben, wenn es diese Entscheidung so setzt, dass sie zur Bestimmung des handelnden Subjektes selbst wird. Die Freiheitsentscheidung ist also wesentlich eine Verfügung des Menschen über sich selbst,

If you grant that a free decision, from its intimate, metaphysical nature, tends to be a total disposition of the freely acting subject about himself, you will realize that every free decision aims at making everything in a man (hence also the blind, spontaneous forces) a manifestation and expression and articulation of the subject's self. A man who is freely deciding wants everything in him to be stamped and informed by his decision; he wants himself to be gathered together and externalized by his decision; in that decision he wants to shape himself and express what he wants to be.

(3) In the concrete, this attempt might more or less succeed along either of the following lines:—

1. First, you may suppress some surging within you that menaces the position you choose to take up. For example, by distracting yourself, you might perfectly eliminate an indeliberate or spontaneous stirring of lust, or a good, indeliberate movement of contrition for some sin you have committed. In both cases you try to make everything in you harmonize with the attitude, good or bad, you have chosen to adopt.

2. Or, secondly, you may not even seek to get rid of the indeliberate act that is running counter to your personal decision, but rather you aim at drawing that act into your personal decision so that this decision may precisely become the more profound and intense. In this way, the indeliberate act, which is apparently a menace to your decision, no longer is such a barrier, but becomes, instead, a necessary precondition. Take the case of a man who wants to act, but sees in his decision to act a real threat to his life. That threat he appraises at its full value, and therefore fears it. Yet he acts in the teeth of fear. His free decision, in that case, is stronger and braver than it would be if he had no fear. He has used his fear to deepen his free decision, so that this is, indeed, ever so much more personal and self-expressive. Not infrequently you meet with such a decision in the lives of the saints. For example, in the life of St. Isaac Jogues. He had already once endured a veritable martyrdom at the hands of the Indians of Canada. He escaped from his torturers. Then his superiors sent him back to the Indian Mission. As he read the letter carrying their decision, he almost fainted from fear. He

und zwar vom innersten Zentrum des Wesens her. Ist aber so die Freiheitsentscheidung die Prägung...des eigenen Seins gerade von seiner *innersten* Zentrum her, also von jenem Kern her, aus dem das ganze metaphysische Wesen des Menschen entspringt und zusammengehalten wird, dann hat die Freiheitsentscheidung auch wesentlich die Tendenz, dieses *ganze* aus dem Zentrum der Person entspringende Wesen bestimmend zu prägen. Die Freiheitsentscheidung hat also die Tendenz über das handelnde Subjekt als Ganzes vor Gott zu verfügen." (Page 71).

knew, with stark lucidity, what awaited him. But he went. His decision to go took on heroic colours precisely because of his most thoroughly informed fear.

Another case (though this is somewhat different, for here there was the gift of integrity) you have in the fear of Christ Our Lord in Gethsemane. That fear was not, in reality, a sort of untamed menace to his personal readiness to suffer; it constituted no threat to his heroic personal decision about himself; but rather it was an inner, perfectly dominated condition of this personal decision, stamping that decision with a higher intensity of courage, making it more profoundly personal, vividly illustrating his "plain heroic magnitude of mind".

Here, then, are two ways in which the free decision, striving always to achieve a total disposition of the whole man, is more or less successful. To achieve its aim, it may eliminate a counter-trend; or, if this is not feasible, it may draw an apparent counter-trend into its own vitality, and, as it were, feeding on this counter-trend, make itself the more vigorous and robust.

2. Dualism.

But the question now arises: to what extent is the autodetermining subject capable of accomplishing a total self-disposition, so that everything in him may be the expression of his personal decision or may be penetrated by this personal decision? Can a man order and control himself in the whole length and breadth of his being? If you ask this question about the average man, about man without the gift of integrity, the answer is an emphatic 'no'. As I have just indicated, more or less success may be achieved in particular circumstances, in individual cases. But, for the average man, success is never complete. We may even go further and say: without the gift of integrity, complete success is not metaphysically possible. For what militates against absolute success in this matter is the dualism in man; and that dualism is rooted in the metaphysical structure of his being. Let us look at this dualism.

The dualism that is in man can be described as a dualism between 'nature' and 'person'. We use this terminology of 'nature' and 'person' because it is very useful to elucidate our ideas; but it does not coincide with the terminology of 'nature' and 'person' used by scholastic theologians à propos of the Blessed Trinity or the Hypostatic Union. Rather we are using 'nature' and 'person' in the sense of the Existentialist philosophers, who, however (and this must be noted), are using

these terms in a sense that is inevitably Christian. For when the Christian theologian, dealing with Original Sin, speaks, as he must speak, of a 'peccatum NATURAE' and a 'peccatum personae', he is using 'nature' and 'person' in a sense that is tantamount to the modern terminology which we are adopting here⁸.

'Person' refers to man in so far as he is the autodetermining subject, shaping himself through his own decisions, possessing and mastering himself in his own decisions. "Nature" refers to everything in man which is presupposed to his free decision and self-mastering, which is the object about which he disposes and the condition of the possibility of self-command and personal decision.

Now, the person choosing wishes to control and possess his nature, yet never quite achieves complete command over it. He never succeeds in making every actuality and potentiality in him the pure and unadulterated expression of what, as a person, he wants to be and intends to be. The person, determining himself, intending to make a total disposition of himself in his free decision, finds himself, to a greater or less extent, withstood, thwarted, defied, countermanded by himself as nature. He finds that many elements in him remain impervious and impenetrable; he wants to make them all personal, but they resist and prove unmanageable. This applies particularly to the blind and spontaneous acts of desire. They often resist the personal decision and persist against it. Often the autodetermining subject does not succeed in removing these contradictions of spontaneous desire; the free decision does not issue forth with such weight as by its very nature it wishes to have; as an upshot it meets with the contradiction and obstinacy of nature, refusing to allow itself to be drawn into the current of the personal decision.

Just because the person wishes in his choices to dispose of himself completely before God, he aims at making even his spontaneous, indeliberate acts the manifestation and expression of what he freely chooses

⁸Father Rahner is well qualified to speak on Existentialism as he has studied this philosophy under Heidegger in Germany. In his 11th footnote Father Rahner writes: "'Natur' (Vorhandenheit) und 'Person' (Existenz) sind hier natürlich verstanden im Sinne heutiger (existentialphilosophischer) Metaphysik. 'Person' ist der Mensch, insofern er über sich frei verfügend entscheidet, seine eigene endgültige Wirklichkeit als Tat seiner Freiheitsentscheidung über sich selbst hat. 'Natur' ist alles am Menschen, was und insofern es dieser Verfügung über sich selbst als ihr Gegenstand und Bedingung ihrer Möglichkeit vorgegeben sein muss..."

to be. He wants to catch up, penetrate, 'personalize' the spontaneous acts so that the reality of these acts might be no longer merely natural but personal. It is in this dualism between nature and person, precisely as it affects the spontaneous acts of desire, that you must seek concupiscence in the theological sense. But of that more later in the third part. For a moment let us ask and try to answer the question: What is the ontological basis of this dualism of nature and person?

Partly, no doubt, the real distinction between essence and existence. In the one Being whose essence is identically his existence, there is, of course, no dualism; person and nature are absolutely one. There can, therefore, in God be no distinction between passive and freely-willed desire. In every finite being there is some sort of dualism. But here you have not the whole answer; for the dualism we are thinking of is specifically human; it is not found in the angels.

Partly, again, the distinction between faculties and between these and the substance of the soul. Hence it arises that the determination of one faculty is not automatically and formally the determination of another. But here, too, you have only a partial explanation, one that does not account for the characteristically human quality of the dualism that is under discussion.

The ultimate and adequate explanation of this problem of man's characteristic dualism is the composite nature of his being, its composition from matter and form. The matter hinders the form from perfectly realising itself as different from matter. It is the materiality of man's being that explains his passivity, the resistance of nature against a personal decision. The materiality of his being explains that lack of self-mastery that is such a feature of human existence. Because man is a composite being of matter and form, there is a principle in him that withstands and throws up a barrier to the personal decision. It is this duality that finds its eloquent expression in so many ascetical writers when they speak of the insurrection of sense against spirit, of flesh against mind. But we shall be on our guard not to conceive this onesidedly. The passivity and spontaneity of nature resisting the dictates of spirit are bi-valent, as I already stressed. It is in this resistance of nature to person or of sense to spirit that you must situate concupiscence. But, of itself, this withstanding of the spontaneous against the deliberate is bi-valent. And it is just as much in evidence when you blush for a lie as when the flesh prompts to lust against the dictate of reason. Just as

reason is bi-valent, leaning towards the morally good or the morally bad, so too is 'nature', is spontaneous desire. And if you choose evilly (for example, to tell a lie) you find the bent of healthy nature gainsaying your evil choice, anticipating it and persisting despite your personal decision.

(To be concluded.)

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

BLESSED PLACIDE VIEL, Second Superior-General of the Sisters of the Christian Schools. By S.C. A Religious of the Institute. Burns, Oates, 1951. 133 pp. 8/6 (Eng.).

Only a few years ago the Sisters of the Christian Schools were rejoicing over the canonization of their foundress, St. Marie Madeleine de Postels. They are now looking forward to the day when a similar honour awaits Blessed Placide Viel whom St. Marie Madeleine trained in the ways of heroism. They were both children of that lovely province of saints, the countryside of Normandy. The young girl who was to be Mother Placide entered the Institute in 1833, when the atmosphere was one of heroic self-abnegation. The nuns slept on palliasses, hardly ever spoke, fasted on bread and water and unappetizing scraps and spent a large part of the night in prayer and work. Thirteen years after her entrance, Mother Placide was elected Superior-General on the death of St. Marie Madeleine. The young General was only thirty-one, but she was by no means inexperienced, as she had already spent some years in the humiliating tasks of begging for her Order. Her journeys took her to Paris, where the Tuileries was one of the mansions where she asked for alms. In this palace, Louis-Philippe and his wife received her, and gave generously. Benevolence was popular in the Paris of the 1840's—at least among the aristocrats.

As a young Superior-General she was spared none of the ill-will that less fervent religious meted out to her. Her biographer speaks of her as "a soul plunged in suffering." A good part of her sanctity seems to have been rooted in silent and joyful suffering, thus allowing her natural gifts to be completely under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Her government of the young institute was marked by the courage and wisdom. Her advice to a young nun in distress must have been her own prescription: "My daughter, go to the foot of the Cross. Our Lord wants you to accompany Him to Calvary. There you will find the strength you need."

The beautiful charity of Mother Placide was a bright patch in the gloom of the Franco-Prussian War. The Mother-House was turned into an emergency hospital containing 150 beds. In spite of her constant ill-health she personally supervised the management of the hospital. Ungrateful rulers of France, ever to forget their heroic religious daughters.

After her death in 1877, the whole countryside flocked to the Abbey to venerate the remains of "the Mother of the poor" whom they loved so to describe. Her coffin of cheap, unstained wood was escorted to the community cemetery by almost the whole population of the surrounding districts, rich and poor; noble and peasant. France had one more saint to pray for her in heaven.

M.O.

Bishop Willson, XIII.

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN DR. WILLSON AND FATHER THERRY.

SEEKING A VERDICT.

Summary: Dr. Willson harshly judged—Lack of humour on both sides—Early blunder of Dr. Willson—Fr. Therry should have returned to Sydney—Dr. Polding appears to blame Dr. Willson—Bishop of Hobart's defence—He was ready to submit the dispute to the Australian bishops—Dr. Polding refuses the offer—His reasons—Fr. McEncroe alleges racial feelings—His view rejected—Unfortunate words of Dean Walsh—Dr. Willson demands, and receives, an apology—Dr. Willson decides to write an account of the dispute—He takes the documents to Oscott College (Birmingham) in 1865—Was Fr. Therry suspended?—A final summing up—Tribute to Fr. Therry's sincere zeal.

The Catholic Church is the Kingdom of God amongst man; holy is this Kingdom notwithstanding the fact that imperfection will appear in the very persons reasonably expected to strive for a high degree of sanctity. It is a truth, consoling and significant, that Christ entrusted to human agents the guardianship of a divine work which neither their negligence nor their malice can destroy. Every era of missionary endeavour has been disfigured by individual defects and lapses: but invariably God's power has produced good out of evil. The very failings of one generation actually contribute somewhat to the wisdom and prudence of another. Of a certainty there must be light and shade, triumphs and failures, in the lives of great men as in the growth of any worthy institution. The historian's duty is to set down a faithful record of facts, to present an impartial interpretation of documents, to reverse, where necessary, opinions previously advocated, and to treat persons and movements in their proper setting.

The detailed narrative of a prolonged dispute over Church debts in Hobart shows that Dr. Willson, whatever his mistakes, did make a sincere bid to avoid discord and to restore peace.

Yet he has been pictured as obstinate, uncompromising, ungenerous. Attempts to palliate or to explain away his alleged severity in the treatment of Father Therry are nothing better than a reluctantly uttered sentence of condemnation. To many of his contemporaries such a verdict appeared to be a fair one. The statements of Archbishop Polding, Dr. Gregory, and Father McEncroe, as well as views widely adopted in England and in Ireland, all pointed in the same direction. Restricted to these as their sole sources of information, biographers have

been hitherto unable to do full justice to the memory of Hobart's first bishop.

Before giving consent to be consecrated, Dr. Willson laid down two conditions: he would not accept liability for debts; and Father Therry must be recalled to Sydney. On both points Archbishop Polding gave satisfactory assurances. With his mind thus at ease, the new Bishop, having in his company two priests, a deacon, and a clerical student, left his homeland. On the very day he landed in Hobart he learned, to his astonishment and annoyance, that a very indefinite debt and a very definite Father Therry had not yet been removed.

Did the Bishop fail to meet the situation in a conciliatory spirit? Possibly. Owing to warnings received from Dr. Ullathorne, he may have been influenced by pre-conceived notions about the obstinacy and the unbusinesslike methods of Father Therry. Unyielding in the face of anything that looked like opposition to his own proposals, the hero of many a battle for justice to Catholics could easily be won over by an appeal to his magnificent generosity; a little judicious flattery might have worked wonders; few would rate it as one of the seven deadly sins. But Dr. Willson simply did not understand an approach of that kind. Unfortunately, neither party to the dispute had been richly endowed with a salutary sense of humour.

Did the Bishop make an error of judgment in opening any discussion whatever with Father Therry? Dr. Charles Davis, O.S.B., thought so. In a letter telling his English friends that Dr. Willson had invited him to Hobart to try his skill as a peacemaker, he remarked:

"It is much to be regretted that the Bishop did not, on finding the Church in debt to the amount of some £3000, immediately decline having anything to do with it until the Archbishop and Mr. Therry, who had been His Grace's V.G. in Van Diemen's Land, should have settled these matters and put all on a good footing.

"Instead of doing this, the Bishop took possession of his Church, got Mr. Therry to make over to him his salary (about £600 a year), which Mr. Therry had hitherto enjoyed as Head of the Church, and then declined the responsibility of the debt. This appears hardly fair, as *emolumenta* and *onera* ought to go together, and considering that Mr. Therry had been solely instrumental in securing this Government salary to the Church, he would naturally expect the Bishop to take from him the responsibility of the Church debt".¹

There exists no basis for the suggestion that something like a confidence trick had been played on Father Therry, plans for his future having been discussed and agreed upon in England. Nor is it quite correct to say that the Bishop "declined the responsibility" of the debt.

¹H. N. Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia*, London, 1911, vol. II., p. 155.

With the possible exception of his first week in the diocese, he had always manifested a willingness to negotiate about the amount due; and from the early months of 1845 to find the full sum claimed. He had succeeded to an office to which a Government salary was attached. To this salary, it is said, Father Therry had been looking as the chief means of meeting his obligations. Whatever may be thought of this policy, inspired though it was by generosity, it cannot be described as the best one to have pursued, especially after the election of a Bishop. The allowance allotted to the Head of the Church, whoever he might be, could not be regarded as an aid to provide necessary buildings: the Government gave it for personal support towards which the people were not expected to contribute directly. The office of Dr. Polding's Vicar-General for Tasmania carried with it no guarantee of permanency: another had, in fact, been removed from that position to make room for Father Therry. The appointment came from the spiritual ruler of the territory. The civil authorities neither made nor unmade such an office: they merely allotted or transferred the legal salary to the person presented by the Church.

Archbishop Polding thought that Father Therry should have been offered "some honorary post, thus to reward his zeal and long services as Vicar-General and to conciliate his adherents". In this suggestion there is nothing admirable. Could not Dr. Polding himself have invited his subject back to Sydney to honour him as deemed desirable for six years of meritorious work as his Vicar-General and for eighteen years of still more meritorious toil in New South Wales? Residence in Hobart for extended periods after resignation contributed nothing to Father Therry's own interests or to the progress of the Church. Some pretended that creditors stood in the way of the priest's departure from the colony. For this supposition no warrant can be discovered. He had liberty to go or stay as he pleased. This freedom he used to the full.

As to the actual Church debt, the sum specified by Father Therry as due to himself amounted to about £700; a similar amount had yet to be provided for the site of St. Joseph's Church; of the monies advanced by John Regan to satisfy contractors, £1500 remained unpaid; and William Insley, a clerk of works, sent in a demand for £400. The title deeds of the above mentioned site had been given to Regan and Insley, presumably as a personal guarantee of the justice of their claims. These deeds, in the priest's sole name, could not in any sense be de-

scribed as legal security. After some hesitation and argument, Dr. Willson declared his readiness to meet all proved liabilities. But Father Therry appears to have required immediate payment in cash, or a legal bond, should regular instalments be agreed upon. He would not transfer legal ownership of the land to trustees of the congregation before the last penny had been received. The Bishop had nothing to offer by way of a satisfactory pledge, even had he been disposed to give it. In any case, he expected his word to be taken as not less sacred than any agreement sealed, signed, and delivered.

Be it remembered that the debts causing most concern to Father Therry were private and personal. Deferring a settlement of these accounts, the priest had been using his own available funds to hasten the erection of a place of worship for his people. Creditors were called upon to exercise patience; but when rumour got busy with the news that Father Therry no longer ruled, they began to exert pressure. In this crisis the agitated priest answered: "I will pay you when the Bishop pays me". The public did not know what to think. Had Dr. Willson made a statement to his flock in the first stages of the conflict, much misunderstanding might have been averted. This he refused to do. He insisted on looking at the affair as a purely domestic one, to be settled privately, and certainly without recourse to outside Tasmania.

Some of the Archbishop's letters helped to foster the impression that Dr. Willson had acted unreasonably. Here is an example:

"However unpleasant, Dr. Willson ought at once to have taken responsibilities as I did. I left the Mission [in 1840] free from debts; when I returned . . . I found a debt of £4000. I had just as much right to repudiate this, I conceive, as Dr. Willson to refuse the debt of Hobart Town. Had I done so, the confidence of the people would have been forfeited, and justly, for ever".

The reference is to the period during which the Rev. Francis Murphy had charge of affairs in New South Wales in the absence of Dr. Polding. Was there anything in common between the two cases? The answer has been, in great part, already set down. With this very point, Dr. Murphy, now Bishop of Adelaide, deals in a letter² to Dr. Willson. He admits he had contracted debts: but he had acted in every detail on the Archbishop's instructions:

"Aware of the painful and unpleasant circumstances in which you have been unfortunately placed through the imprudence of poor Mr. Therry, I was very anxious to hear from you. I now regret to learn from your kind letter that this unpleasant affair still remains unsettled. It would be a sad thing that you should suffer for Mr. Therry's imprudence and make yourself responsible for debts of so great an amount; and, on the other hand, I know not what Mr. Therry is to do to extricate himself out of the difficulty. Either you or he must suffer, and I

²Letter in *Hobart Archives*.

certainly am of opinion that it would be very hard to expect that you should be ruined in consequence of his imprudence. I pity the poor man from my heart; but should I, upon my arrival in Adelaide, have found that my predecessor, Mr. Mahoney, had involved me in debt to the amount of two or three thousand pounds without any authority to do so from the Archbishop, I certainly (hard as the case might appear) would allow him to abide the fruits to his imprudence rather than hang a weight around my own neck which would take whole years to remove. During the Archbishop's stay in Europe I undertook the building of a few churches in New South Wales which were very much in debt upon his return; but these churches were commenced under his express sanction and according to his own plans; and he was, of course, bound upon his return to take upon himself the responsibility of the debt. Mr. Therry, upon the other hand, never consulted anyone, but has plunged the mission into a debt which it is ruinous to contemplate. On whatever side of this most unfortunate affair is viewed it is surrounded with difficulties; but when things are at their worst, and when no human means of escaping your own difficulty appear, it is then that our good Lord comes to our assistance and turns evil into good. This trial is a reward which the Almighty sends you for the sacrifice you have made in leaving your own beloved flock and happy home to devote yourself to His service in the ends of the earth. I have not forgotten to remember you and your flock in my daily sacrifice: I trust the remembrance is, and will be, mutual".

Again Bishop Willson is censured—this time in a reply to letters from Fathers Butler, Bond, and Woolfrey—for having declined to negotiate directly with Father Therry. For this refusal some excuse can be offered. Long experience had proved that interviews between Priest and Bishop had generally created unpleasantness, widening, instead of healing, the existing breach. However, let us hear the Archbishop:³

"When Mr. Therry left Sydney [in 1848] I strongly advised him to place papers, documents, etc., in the hands of the Bishop, and to carry out the terms of the agreement—signed by himself, by the Bishop and Clergy—substantially that of the 2nd July, 1846. I believe he sailed from Sydney with the intention of doing this. How was he received? Not permitted to see the Bishop, but handed over to be dealt with by a Protestant lawyer. . . . Granting, as I readily do, that for various reasons the Bishop was justified in declining to transact the business personally with Mr. Therry, might not the Vicar-General or some one of the clergy be appointed to meet one, who, whatever may be his faults, is still an anointed priest of God?"

Dr. Willson had his answer ready:

"Your Grace is pleased to express very strong disapprobation (to use a moderate term) on account of Mr. Therry being referred to a Protestant lawyer—'handed over', as you term it 'to be dealt with by a Protestant lawyer'. My Lord, the case is simply this: When Mr. Therry presented himself at my house in June last, I did humbly hope, that in carrying out the *principle* of your own decision so forcibly expressed in Rome, you would have induced him to yield to reason, etc. Alas! How, again, were my hopes dashed to the ground!

"I thought it prudent before I could consent to see Mr. Therry, to request Mr. O. Woolfrey to attend him, and ascertain the state of things, and see if any hopes of a settlement could be entertained. My lord, Mr. Woolfrey spent nearly two hours with him, and although he had never seen Mr. W. before, and who is, moreover, the meekest of men, Mr. Therry was as biting, as sarcastic, and as unbending as ever. Alas! What could I do? To whom could I refer him? How could I be so weak as to expect to be able to 'win his confidence', as you are pleased to say I ought to have done? What could I do with such a person?"

³Letter to Dr. Willson of October, 1848.

Mr. Pitcairn, the solicitor (*cum talis sis utinam noster esses*)—we have no Catholic attorney—had been applied to in 1846, to put in legal form the very terms you sanctioned when in Rome. To this gentleman I referred Mr. Therry, not having other terms than those, modified to meet the great change that has taken place since 1846. This is the simple fact, as far as the Protestant solicitor is concerned. . . .

"... But, perhaps, I may be permitted to ask, did not Your Grace, only last June, apply by letter to the Colonial Secretary of this place, a gentleman who is not a Catholic, but a Protestant, requesting him to use his good offices in causing an arrangement in these affairs to be made? And where, I would respectfully inquire, is the principle less pernicious in this Protestant gentleman using his influence with Mr. Therry and me than that of Mr. Pitcairn being employed to draw up a document in legal form to protect me [from being misunderstood and misrepresented . . .]. I may add that Mr. Therry has employed the following gentlemen professionally, *all Protestants* (nor do I object to them on that account); but surely I may be permitted, on an affair of such deep moment, to be allowed to have the opinion of one legal adviser before fixing my hand to paper. . . ."

There follows a list of six names of individuals and firms whose legal advice Father Therry had sought at various stages of the controversy. All of them had found him a difficult client. He began by seeking counsel: he ended by giving it.

Through Dr. Cox, Rector of St. Edmund's College, London, documents relating to the dispute were forwarded to Rome, informing the Holy See that the case had not been settled. A letter, dated March 5, 1850, from the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda was promptly despatched to Bishop Willson, instructing him to have an end put to the trouble in his diocese. "The interest of religion", said the Cardinal, "requires that the dispute be settled as soon as possible. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that letters should be sent to you, and, at the same time, to the Archbishop of Sydney, to announce . . . that this case should be discussed in a Council of Bishops . . . and in Council should be decided by common deliberation whatever shall seem to be the Divine Will. But if this cannot be accomplished, all matters shall be made known to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda so that a proper decision may be given".

On receipt of this letter in September the Bishop of Hobart at once⁴ notified Dr. Polding that he was agreeable to have the affair determined by an Episcopal Synod, to be held anywhere, suggesting Hobart as his own preference. Here we are up against one of the puzzling features of the story. Did the Archbishop call or desire to call the Bishops together? To Bishop Serra he explains his motives for not doing so:

"I was on the point of requesting your attendance at a Synod which the Holy See intimated its wish to be convened—in case I considered that by means

of the Synod the sad discussions which have been going on in Van Dieman's Land for many years could be terminated. Of this I saw no prospect, and consequently I did not convene the Prelates of the Province. One party had entered his protest against any decision to which the Bishops might come; and the other had rejected the terms which I myself drew up as meeting the equity of the case—so the matter is at once referred to the Holy See."

Did Dr. Willson protest against any synodal decree that might be arrived at? The evidence is all the other way. In June, 1857, he wrote:

"Why was not a Provincial Council long since summoned? . . . I hope I am not outstepping the limits of propriety by the inquiry, as one of Your Grace's suffragans, why a Provincial Council has not been called since August, 1844—thirteen years since. . . . Truly this affair of Mr. Therry has not prevented so solemn and important benefit being afforded the Church. To me this omission has been a source of much sorrow. Had the Bishops met in Council my character would have stood fairer with the Holy See than it did in December".

Again:

"If you are convinced that Therry is right . . . call, I conjure you, a Provincial Council immediately. As soon as I learn whether or not it is Your Grace's pleasure to summon a Provincial Council immediately, or (which I am willing to agree to) a meeting of the Bishops *not in Council*, with an equal number of clergymen to be selected by Your Grace and me. to investigate the whole affair . . . I shall know how to proceed".

And to Cardinal Barnabo the Bishop wrote:—

"The Archbishop has also objected to summon a Provincial Council for years. . . . Why object to have the affair laid before a Provincial Council in order, if I were in error, that my conduct might be reported to the Holy See?"

Other documents to the same effect could be cited. It is clear that Dr. Wilson never objected to the examination of the case by the Bishops. To one in Dr. Polding's position the affairs of Hobart naturally appeared to be of minor significance. More serious problems had to be solved or studied every day in his own archdiocese. Finding it impossible to deal personally with the immense volume of correspondence reaching Sydney from all parts of Australia, from Rome, and from Europe generally, the Archbishop could not give more than passing attention to a dispute which, as had been said by several onlookers, "two sensible men could settle in a few minutes."

In a petition sent to Rome pleading for the creation of new dioceses in Australia Father McEncroe gives a novel explanation of the disturbed condition of the Church in Tasmania:

"If an Irish Bishop had been appointed for Hobart Town I think the dissensions and scandals that have taken place from the dispute between Monseigneur Willson and Father Therry would have been avoided, and that religion would be *there* in a much better state than it is at present. Unfortunately, the Irish and English characters are very different in their nature, and when any difference takes place between an English Bishop and an Irish priest, then national antipathies and mutual distrusts spring up and prevent a proper understanding and thus perpetuate bad feelings. In my opinion, very few Englishmen know how to guide or govern Irishmen, whether lay or ecclesiastical".

In peace as well as in storm priests of Irish birth, including Father McEncroe himself, have served their Lord and Leader under the direction of Catholic Bishops of English nationality. Any one in Dr. Willson's position would have acted very much as he did: not many would have been so patient and so silent. The Archbishop, an Englishman, failed to see eye to eye on most subjects with the Bishop, another Englishman. Is this to be explained by invoking national traits and feelings? Both priest and bishop had sacrificed much, including home and country, to make Christ known at the ends of the earth. Dr. O'Brien disposes of Father McEncroe's statement with this comment:

"It was perfectly clear through every phase of the long struggle that 'national antipathies' neither caused nor prolonged the Tasmanian dispute. Bishop Willson and Father Therry had the cause of the Australian Church too deeply at heart to find time for old world grievances and distinctions of nationalities. Their common priesthood provided a higher form of nationality".

In Hobart some few did attempt to stir up national feelings. Any weapon of assault is greedily seized by the advocates of an ignoble cause. The chief offenders were two or three Protestant Irishmen whose attachment to any movement had its inspiration and guiding motive in deep-seated hostility to everything Catholic. "Thank God," wrote the Bishop to one whom he regarded as having confounded religion with party spirit, "every Irish Catholic has... a sense of his duty. I regard this attempt to incite feeling against Mr. Hall and myself as... the worst feature of the whole business." Two Catholics who had appeared to countenance a meeting where statements of an offensive nature were made apologised most humbly, without any kind of inducement or pressure being invoked, for their share in the proceedings.

What caused Dr. Willson particular pain was this: long after the trouble had been forgotten in Tasmania the Bishop's affairs kept coming up for review in England and in Ireland in the press and in ecclesiastical circles, generally to his disadvantage. In January, 1862, Dean Walsh, then touring the land of his birth, addressed an open *Letter on the State of Religion and Education in the Archdiocese of Sydney and the Colony of New South Wales*, to Archbishop Cullen, of Dublin. His motives were praiseworthy inasmuch as he had written in vindication of Dr. Polding's administration and in defence of Abbot Gregory, who had been withdrawn from Sydney. Imprudently transgressing the limits assigned to himself by the title of his pamphlet the Dean wrote:

"The cause, Father Therry v. Bishop Willson, is as follows: Father Therry was the only priest in Hobart Town and in the whole of the Island of Tasmania in the year 1838. In the year '39 he began a Church in Hobart Town, and finished it, but when completed it was £3000 in debt. During the building of this Church

Archbishop Polding visited Europe and got Dr. Willson appointed Bishop of Van Dieman's Land. When Bishop Willson arrived in Hobart Town, Father Therry gave him up his salary of £600 per year, and the Church and all other things connected with the Catholic religion in that Island. Bishop Willson would not then acknowledge the debt, or take the responsibility of it on himself or the Mission. Father Therry said he would collect the money if he got eighteen months to collect it through the diocese, but Bishop Willson would not grant them. The matter was then referred to the Archbishop of Sydney, and His Grace called a number of his clergy to consult about the matter. I was one of that number, and all agreed that Bishop Willson ought to pay the debt, and that it was very unreasonable of him to expect to get a Church and mission free of debt, in a diocese so lately founded. Dr. Gregory and Father Sumner were sent to consult with Bishop Willson, but all in vain. Dr. Willson would not agree to accept the debt upon the diocese, and thus the matter remained in dispute and quarrel for twelve years, to the great injury of the Catholic religion. In the end, Dr. Willson settled the matter, and it would have been much better if he had done so at first".

Can we wonder that such a travesty of facts caused Bishop Willson to be exceedingly annoyed? He drew Dr. Polding's attention to the matter suggesting that Dean Walsh ought not to be allowed to resume his duties in New South Wales until reparation had been made. The Archbishop, too, felt grieved. Answering the Hobart Bishop he said:—

"I trust it is scarcely necessary for me to assure Your Lordship that I had not, nor had Dr. Gregory, any knowledge of Dean Walsh's intention to publish his pamphlet. The honest avowal of the truth against the vague and base slanders on my administration give me, I confess, pleasure and consolation; but everything was marred by his injudicious and needless, and inaccurate introduction of Your Lordship's affairs. Everyone whom I have heard speak of the pamphlet regrets and condemns at once this portion of it. I do not know what he means by indicating that he received information from me. My memory supplies no recollection of any set conversation with him on the subject: Casually, and in very general terms, I may have spoken of it to him. Pity it is that his good purpose should have been disfigured by so much bad taste and erroneous statement. I am sorry, very sorry, for this fact, and for him, too, but he must bear the consequences".

One year after publication of his Letter the Dean put into circulation a leaflet in which he tried to repair the damage:—

"In January, 1862, I addressed a printed letter to His Grace, the Most Rev. Archbishop Cullen, in which I inconsiderately made a statement that reflected on the character of the Right Rev. Dr. Willson, Bishop of Hobart Town, in reference to Church money affairs of long standing in which the Rev. J. J. Therry was interested. I have discovered the error I unhappily fell into, and now wish to express my sincere and deep regret for it".

With the Dean's apology—copies of which were circulated in leaflet form in England, Ireland, and New South Wales—the Bishop declared himself as satisfied. But the damage had been done. Sick and tired—it is his own expression—of hearing these charges repeated the Bishop made up his mind to print for 'private circulation' a selection of letters in his possession. That explains why he took all the documents with him to England in 1865. These valuable and interesting papers found their way to Oscott College to be left undisturbed until recent times

when they were generously restored to the archives of the Archdiocese of Hobart.

Not everyone found it easy to co-operate with Father Therry or to win his confidence. So long had he stood alone, monarch of all he surveyed, honoured and loved for his intense devotion to the cause dearest to his heart, that he resented any semblance of discipline or restraint imposed by men coming in at the eleventh hour. Capable of heroic acts of humility and submission at one moment, he could be at another exceptionally obstinate in adhering to his own opinion, however strong the case in favour of a different course. He never admitted defeat. Gradually he built up a barrier between himself and numerous Hobart benefactors, not excepting John Regan, his trusted lieutenant in many a crisis. The Bishop, too, could be stirred to anger. With him, however, an outburst occurred rarely and a long calm followed the storm. English and Tasmanian acquaintances recognised his characteristic gentleness and toleration in dealing with any troublesome situation. Working as a priest with experienced and prudent leaders like Wiseman and Walsh he had learned that love is the fulfilling of the law.

Did Father Therry suffer the penalty of suspension? Would it not be more correct to say that the Bishop forbade him to offer Mass in the diocese of Hobart? This happened towards the end of the year 1884. On December 12th, the priest in a letter to the Colonial Secretary refers to St. Joseph's Church "from which as a clergyman I am now excluded", adding in a later sentence, "Dr. Willson has prohibited my performance of ecclesiastical duty". To this unhappy development the earliest public reference we have noticed is seen in the *Hobart Town Advertiser* of September 2nd, 1845. The newspaper gives a report of a meeting held at Father Therry's residence "to co-operate with the committee formed in Sydney to assist in the liquidation of a portion of the debts contracted by him on account of St. Joseph's Church". Father Therry produced a letter from the Bishop forbidding this meeting. Readers are informed:

"A question was put to the Rev. Gentleman if it was true that he had been prohibited by the Bishop from officiating as priest at St. Joseph's Church.

"Mr. Therry replied: 'The Bishop does not wish me to celebrate Mass there'.

"Questioner: 'May I respectfully ask you, do you feel the notification you have received as a prohibition?'

"Rev. Mr. Therry: 'I certainly feel it as a prohibition. But I fully recognise the Bishop's right to do so, although it is not usual for persons receiving appointments to take such a course'."

This penalty inflicted on Father Therry did not affect him outside Bishop Willson's territory. From August, 1846, until June, 1848,—

with the exception of a hurried call at Hobart on the way from Melbourne to Sydney—the priest was away from Tasmania. Whether the prohibition was renewed on his return to Hobart we are not in a position to determine. But it would seem not. Archbishop Polding, in a letter sent to Dr. Willson, speaks of Father Therry as “having been denied the liberty of performing any sacerdotal function in any circumstances and this for months”. The use of the expression “for months” suggests that permission to offer Mass had been restored before the date of Dr. Polding’s communication. That restrictions had been or were going to be removed may likewise be inferred from a note dated June 8, 1850. In reply to a letter from Dr. Polding the Bishop said:

“I begged your advice as to the propriety of permitting Mr. Therry to celebrate Mass under existing circumstances: I pressed Your Grace to state to me clearly what your wishes were on that subject....From Your Grace’s letter I gather that you are of opinion that Mr. Therry should still be permitted to say Mass.”

On another point it is possible to be more definite. Father Therry is referred to as one who had been “denied the Sacrament of Penance, all the priests of the diocese being directed not to absolve him”.⁵ It is certainly pleasing to read Dr. Willson’s comment on this statement: “The Archbishop is in error. Mr. Therry had full liberty to confess to any priest he pleased”.

The conclusion seems to be that Father Therry in all good faith and convinced of the justice of his cause adopted the wrong means to attain this end. Having abandoned the better course he obstinately—virtuously in his own judgment—persevered therein encouraged by what he regarded as the backing of leading Churchmen in Sydney. This view does not in the least detract from the work done for God and Australia by a grand and exemplary missionary priest; nor does his refusal to accept reasonable terms remove him from the place of honour he fills as the founder of a great Church, its champion and its hero. Here we are interested in the life and labours of Bishop Willson, styled by Archbishop O’Brien, “one of the greatest men in the history of Tasmania”. Father Therry, with whom he came into conflict, flits across these pages in only one episode. To know him it is necessary to follow his whole career in Australia from 1820 to 1864—from the date of his coming until the day of his death. It is a glorious history which must be read in the *Life* written by a candid and masterly pen, that of Dr. Eris M. O’Brien, now Archbishop-Auxiliary to Cardinal Gilroy.

⁵Quoted from a letter of Dr. Polding.

The verdict of those who knew the apostolic priest, and of all who have studied the documents published by Dr. O'Brien will remain unshaken. It is well expressed by Patrick O'Donohoe, an Irish Exile of the Revolution of 1848:

"Every voice proclaims Father Therry to be a pure, pious, zealous, untiring missionary; that his labours have been incessant; that his acts of charity to all men have been unbounded; and that he has made more converts to Catholicity amidst the wilderness of these regions than all other men; and that, too, at an early period when he was almost unaided in his heaven-born work of charity and love. We look upon him as a second St. Francis Xavier."

(To be continued)

J. H. CULLEN.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

ST. JOSEPH'S PARISH, Temuka, South Canterbury, N.Z. By P. P. Cahill, S.M. 94 pp., 1951. 7/6.

This well produced magazine was written to commemorate seventy-five years' development of Temuka parish. Father Fauvel, S.M., began the parish in 1876, and it has been conducted by the Marist Fathers. An interesting list of the successive parish priests up to 1951, with notable parochial events, make up the bulk of the magazine. A great amount of information is given about the schools, pioneer families, and various sporting bodies connected with the parish. The narrative is much enhanced by the numerous illustrations, which are very well produced; together they form an attractive souvenir of this flourishing parish in the Diocese of Christchurch.

T.V.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS, IX. THE OFFERERS OF THE SACRIFICE.

Up to this point we have been considering the holy Sacrifice of the Mass in its intimate nature. We now wish to fix our minds on those who offer the Clean Oblation to God our Father as the supreme gesture of worship in which we pour out our hearts in adoration, reparation, thanksgiving and petition. This will help us to appreciate more fully the inexhaustible riches of the great Christian Sacrifice, and to make it the vital sanctifying force in our lives that Christ our Lord most surely intended it to be.

Who offers the Sacrifice of the Mass? Christ, our High Priest, and everyone who, through incorporation in Christ our mystical Head, glories in the title of "Alter Christus". It is the Sacrifice of the Mystical Body. There are three offerers of the Sacrifice: Christ, the consecrating-priest, and the faithful. But they offer in different ways. So we shall consider each one in turn, endeavouring to discover the precise part played by each in this divine drama that is daily enacted on our altars to perpetuate peace between Heaven and earth.

CHRIST, THE HIGH PRIEST.

1) It is a Dogma of Faith that Christ our Lord does in all truth offer each Sacrifice of the Mass. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) defined: "One and the same Jesus Christ is priest and sacrifice (= victim), whose Body and Blood are truly contained in this sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine".¹ And Trent defined: "The same (Christ) now offers Himself by the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross, only the manner of offering being different".²

2) Given that our Lord does truly offer the Sacrifice, it is evident, and is held by all theologians, that He is the *principal offerer*. This truth is undoubtedly contained in the definition of Trent, just quoted. Christ offers "by the ministry of His priests", who are, therefore, His instruments and subordinates in this work of Sacrifice. He is the one High Priest of the New Covenant, without equal or successor (cf. Hebrews, 7, 23-28). Never can He exercise His priesthood in subordi-

¹Denzinger, 430.

²Ibid, 940.

nation to another; but all others whom He graciously admits to a share in His priesthood exercise their sacerdotal powers under His supreme causal influence. Consequently, no sacrifice of the New Law can be offered unless Christ be the principal Offerer, perpetually exercising His eternal priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech.

3) But when it is asked: HOW is Christ the principal Offerer of the Sacrifice?, agreement gives way to discord. The precise question is this: Is Christ our Lord the principal Offerer of the Sacrifice in the sense that He *immediately and actually*, by a formally elicited act of His will, makes a personal offering of Himself in every Mass? The vast majority of theologians to-day maintains that He does. They see Christ the Priest ceaselessly operating in every Consecration, offering Himself not less truly or actually on the altar than He did on the Cross of Calvary, or in the first Mass, which He alone offered in the Cenacle. This teaching also prevailed among the older theologians, who held "that to be by far the more true and more common teaching which maintains that He, as principal priest, is the immediate Offerer, making a formal, actual, and elicited oblation".³

Other theologians, however, would have none of this doctrine. While admitting that Christ is the principal priest of the Sacrifice, they deny that He offers the Sacrifice personally, immediately, actually. They are content with a *mediate, virtual offering* on the part of the High Priest, which is verified in the fact that He instituted this Sacrifice and merited all the graces dispensed therein, and in the fact that He confers on the priests the power to offer in His name. They are His vicars. It is maintained that this remote co-operation on Christ's part suffices to safeguard His prerogative as the principal priest of the Sacrifice.

This position was held of old by Scotus,⁴ but it has relatively few modern defenders.⁵ Father de la Taille has supported it with great

³Thus the Salmanticenses, De Euch., disp. 13, dub. 3 n. 49. Among the older theologians who embraced this teaching, the following may be cited: Cajetan, John of St. Thomas, Suarez, St. Bellarmine, Gonet, Coninck, Miranda, Tannero; the French School: Bérulle, Condren, Olier, Thomassin, Bossuet, etc. Among the modern theologians: Lepin, Ghir, Lépiciér, Billot Vacant, Grimal, Garrigou-Lagrange, Hervé, A. Michel, Diekamp, Van Hove, Ferland, Petazzi, Doronzo, Piolanti.

⁴Quodlibet 20, n. 22. In this Scotus was followed by Biel, Vasquez, Becanus, Azorius, G. Hurtado.

⁵D'Alès, De S. Eucharistia (1929), p. 110 sq; Merkelbach, Theol. Moralis De Eucharistia (1931), p. 277; de la Taille, Mysterium Fidei (1921), p. 295 sq. Merkelbach adds: "In the Last Supper, Christ, foreseeing all the future sacrifices, willed that all should be to the honour of God, and offered them to Him; and this His will was not retracted but habitually remains."

vigour and tenacity as one of the main elements of his new theory of the Mass. If, he says, Christ were placed anew in a state of victimhood in the Mass, one could readily concede that He also makes a new, personal oblation of Himself on the altar. But since there is no new sacrificial immolation of Christ in the Mass, therefore there is no new act of oblation on His part. Any new oblation is made by the priests of the Church, although the power to offer comes from Christ. "Thus Christ offers through us offering, without Himself offering personally".⁶

This is not a dispute between Unicists and Dualists. Bishop A. MacDonald, for example, as ardent an Unicist as any, energetically maintains that our Lord does personally offer the Mass. "And He offers it immediately, because He offers as Principal Agent".⁷ On the other hand, we find Father Heris, O.P., a distinct Dualist, expressing as his opinion the opposed teaching of mediate, virtual oblation.⁸ We shall discuss his reasons later. For the present it is sufficient to note that this question does not seem to be essentially related to the question of the formal constituent of the Sacrifice, and one may, without appearing illogical, hold either of the teachings proposed, whatever be one's convictions concerning the essence of the Mass. The question is purely one of evidence, particularly the evidence presented in the Church's pronouncements, and of sound theological reasoning.

4) Surely no one will dismiss this question as an idle speculation of theologians, having no practical bearing on our lives nor enriching our concept of the Sacrifice of our altars! Nothing could be further from the truth, as the following considerations may help to demonstrate: a) we saw, when dealing with sacrifice in general, that the *internal* sacrifice of oneself by which one gives to God one's whole life and being is the really important, vital, dynamic aspect of sacrifice. It is the aspect whence sacrifice derives its religious value, its moral worth and greatness. If the internal immolation and oblation of oneself is absent, the external immolation and oblation of the victim, which is meant to be the visible expression of the internal sacrifice, becomes a lie, an hypocrisy. It is easily seen that the worth and moral value of sacrifice depend not only on the victim that is sacrificed, but also and more so on the religious intensity and dignity of him who makes the oblation. Now, as regards the Mass, no one will fail to see that if Christ our Lord, present on the

⁶Mysterium Fidei, p. 296.

⁷The Sacrifice of the Mass (1924), p. 119.

⁸Il Mistero di Cristo (1938), p. 264.

altar, *actually and personally makes the oblation of Himself as Victim* to God the Father, that act of oblation is worth more than all the oblations of all the priests and faithful put together. It is an act of infinite sacrificial worship, worthy of the infinite dignity and value of the Victim that is sacrificed, and worthy of the perfect religion that Christ established among men. That personal act of oblation on the part of Christ the Priest, offering Himself in the name of all the members of the Mystical Body, of which He is the vitalizing Head, would be the supreme seal on the spotless Sacrifice, the supreme guarantee of wholehearted acceptance on the part of God our Father, the supreme joy of the Mystical Body, all the members of which would unite their personal oblations with that of their priestly Head and rest content in the secure knowledge that the arms of God would open wide to receive them all, made one with the infinitely pleasing oblation of His own beloved Son. Such a concept opens up the ineffable riches of the Mass, and cannot fail to thrill the Catholic heart. In the teaching of remote, mediate, virtual oblation on Christ's part, on the other hand, we are presented with a concept of the Mass that is far less rich and seems to detract from the full perfection of Christian worship and the infinite value and dignity of the Sacrifice of the Mystical Body. To offer vicariously is to offer less perfectly. And this is eminently true when the Offerer is Christ.

If the Catholic heart could choose between these two formulae: "Per Jesum Christum offert Ecclesia", and "Per Ecclesiam offert Jesus Christus", there is little doubt that it would choose the former. This, then, is a vital question. It touches the very soul of the Mass; it opens up new visions in the sacred sanctuary of Catholic worship; it draws the soul closer to Christ the Priest ever dwelling in our midst and perpetually offering Himself among us on our behalf.

b) If this teaching of an actual, personal oblation of the Sacrifice by Christ on the altar is true, it must be a source of profound inspiration to all priests of the Church as they stand at the altar. Consider the all-perfect dispositions that fill the soul of Christ in that sacred moment of the Consecration. They are those very dispositions, in all their intensity, that consumed Him when, as Priest, on the altar of the Cross He made the oblation of Himself, the Victim, to the eternal Father. Supreme adoration, most ardent love, wholehearted reparation, all-perfect religion in a soul totally consecrated to the Divinity! The priest, conscious of this perfection of Christ's oblation of Himself in his priestly hands, and knowing that his own oblation of the Sacrifice must become united to

that of Christ, must surely strive to make his own oblation as perfect as possible, and as like to the High Priest's as he possibly can make it.

At the same time, what a source of consolation is contained in this teaching! Human nature being what it is, there is the possibility that at the very moment when the priest performs his most solemn function his attention may be distracted from the sublime mystery that is wrought in his hands. If he alone makes the immediate, actual oblation of the Sacrifice, it must follow that the whole offering of the Mystical Body, of which he is the member deputed to perform this task, is wanting in that full perfection of worship which must surely be found in the perfect religion of Christ. But Christ is never distracted! His soul is fixed on God in supreme contemplation and adoration. If, then, He personally offers the Sacrifice, we can be sure that in every Consecration on the face of the earth a perfect act of worship is performed by the Mystical Body through Christ, its perfect Head.

c) For the faithful, too, this teaching holds great treasures. They will more readily appreciate that the Mass is substantially the same Sacrifice as that of the Cross, though enacted now and renewed in a different order. For, this doctrine assures us that we have on the Altar not only the same Victim and the same Priest of Calvary, but that the High Priest actually does again and again what He did on the Cross: He *personally and immediately* makes the oblation of His sacrificed Body and Blood to God the Father. Moreover, they will fix their minds and hearts more intently on Christ, the principal Priest of the Sacrifice, actually offering Himself (and them), and they will seek to unite themselves more closely with Him, and their oblation more intimately with His oblation.

No wonder, then, that this teaching has captured the minds and hearts of the majority of students of the Mass. In it alone is found that perfect fellowship of the whole Mystical Body, Head and members, united in the greatest act of worship that it can perform. Through the Head all things are offered to God and received from Him. Shall the offering par excellence be excluded? Shall the Head remain passive, disassociating Himself, as it were, from the Body's sublimest cultual activity? The Apostle assures us: "Christ has an *everlasting priesthood*, whereby He is able to save forever those that come to God *by Him*, always living to make intercession for us". (Hebrews, 7, 24). Don't these words receive their fullest and most wonderful significance in the

teaching of Christ's actual and immediate oblation of Himself, the Victim, in the Christian Sacrifice?

ASSERTION.

Christ, the principal Priest of the Sacrifice, personally, actually, and immediately makes the oblation of Himself, the Victim, in every Mass.

I. First of all, we shall briefly consider the question *negatively*, showing that the reasons advanced against this more common teaching are not only not conclusive but quite unavailing.

a) Fr. de la Taille says that if there were a new sacrificial immolation of Christ in the Mass one would have to concede a new actual oblation on Christ's part. But there is no new immolation, or placing of Christ in a state of victimhood.

Reply: There is a new sacrificial immolation of Christ the Victim in the Mass. The Mass is essentially that new unbloody immolation, as we have demonstrated.

b) Scotus, Vasquez, and de la Taille object that such an act on Christ's part would be truly meritorious. But Christ can no longer acquire merits for us: He is now outside the state of merit, "in termino viae".

Reply: There is no question of Christ's acquiring new merits for us by this new act of priestly oblation, any more than there is by His priestly intercession for us in heaven (Hebrews, 7, 24). It is a question of the *application* of merits already superabundantly acquired.

c) Scotus and de la Taille protest: if Christ Himself makes the immediate, actual oblation of Himself, the Mass would be equivalent in value and dignity to the Sacrifice of the Cross. Thus the sufficiency of the Cross is destroyed.

Reply: The Mass is *substantially* the same Sacrifice as that of the Cross, as we have explained. Now, the actual oblation of Christ, considered in its latreutic and eucharistic aspects, is of infinite value and infinitely honours God. But, considered in its impetratory and propitiatory effects, two things must be remembered: first, no new merits are acquired by it, but the merits of the Cross are applied by it, and thus no injury is offered to the all-sufficiency of the Cross. Secondly, while the impetratory and propitiatory effects of this actual oblation, considered objectively in themselves, are morally infinite, nevertheless they are finite in their application to us, depending on the dispositions of the subjects who receive them. Besides, all must admit that the Mass is equivalent in value and dignity to the Sacrifice of the Cross as far as the

victim is concerned. And no one suggests that this infinite moral value detracts from the infinite moral value of the Cross.

d) Since there are many Consecrations every minute (four every second?) Christ would ceaselessly, even simultaneously, be eliciting new acts of oblation. Which is clearly intolerable. (De la Taille⁹).

Reply: Christ can actually, immediately and personally make the oblation of every Mass without a multiplication of acts. In the Beatific Vision eternally enduring in His soul, and not measured by successive points of time, He sees all the Sacrifices; and by one elicited act, without interruption or repetition (like the Beatific Vision itself, and His beatific love, adoration and thanksgiving) He makes the oblation of each and every Sacrifice to His eternal Father.

e) Christ, as man (by which He is also priest) is seated in glory at the Father's right hand, and does not actually and properly *adore* the Father. He is adored, not an adorer. But if He were to make the actual oblation of the Mass, He would truly be an adorer of the Godhead. Therefore the teaching cannot be admitted. (Fr. de la Taille¹⁰).

Reply: We find that a very strange and hard saying. Firstly, the human nature of Christ is a creature; and a creature it will remain eternally. Hence it is completely dependent on God, and is bound to all those duties to Him which spring from the ontological relations that exist between man and God. By that we mean primarily the duty to acknowledge God's supreme excellence and adore His infinite majesty. The very metaphysical position of Christ, as man, namely His creaturehood, will always postulate His moral position of an adorer of the Godhead. God Himself could not exempt any created rational nature from this obligation, without ceasing to be God. It matters not one iota whether that created nature be on earth or in heaven, as far as these moral bonds, which spring from the ontological bonds, are concerned. The eternal position of Christ, as man, must be one of subordination, as St. Paul teaches: "The Son also himself shall be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all". (1 Cor. 15, 28). Secondly, the Church clearly teaches that Christ, as man, eternally adores the Godhead, giving supreme praise and thanksgiving, even as He unceasingly prays for all of us.¹¹ Most surely Christ in the Eucharist adores His eternal Father. And the Christ of the Eucharist is the absolutely

⁹Esquisse du mystère de la Foi, 1924, p. 69.

¹⁰Loc. cit., p. 72.

¹¹Cf. e.g. Office of the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus, hymn for lauds.

identical glorified Christ Who is at the Father's right hand. He cannot adore in the Eucharist and, at the same time, not adore in Heaven. Thirdly, in Heaven there is a most intense religious life of eternal adoration. And in Christ's glorified soul there is certainly the infused virtue of religion: He cannot be conceived without it. And does not the perfect adoration of the court of Heaven consist precisely in the union of all the glorified members with Christ, their mystical Head, in an eternal and unspeakably profound act of adoration, love, praise and thanksgiving? Heaven would not be Heaven without that!

f) Finally, Fr. Heris places this difficulty: What is signified by the words of Consecration is the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ under the sacred species, not the internal and invisible oblation.¹²

Reply: We cannot agree with that. What is signified by the words of Consecration is the presence of Christ's Body and Blood *sacramentally separated*: or, the presence of Christ the Victim *in a state of sacrificial immolation*, externally manifesting the internal, invisible dedition and oblation of Himself, the Victim, to God the Father.

Again Fr. Heris objects: in this teaching it seems that the Mass becomes, at least in its principal part, an *invisible* sacrifice; for Christ's oblation is internal and invisible.

Reply: That would be so if Christ's internal oblation of Himself were not *manifested externally* by some efficacious sign. But it is; and very eloquently. The whole of the external, visible part of the Sacrifice is the outward expression of the internal, invisible sacrifice by which the soul offers itself completely to God. Thus the sacramental separation of Christ's Body and Blood, under the separate species, manifests visibly the invisible oblation of Himself as Victim in a true sacrifice. And the words do likewise: "This is *my* body, this is *my* blood".

Hence, as far as we may judge, no cogent theological reason is advanced against this teaching. One is inclined to say: "Christus potest, ergo facit". But not all that is highly desirable is necessarily true; so we must have recourse to positive evidence if we are to have a sound foundation for our teaching.

2. POSITIVE PROOFS:

a) *From the Church's teaching.*

It seems clear enough to us that the statements of the Church, taken in their obvious, natural sense, profess that Christ our Lord immediately and actually offers the Sacrifice. It even seems that in this teaching alone is the Church's doctrine fully preserved.

¹²Il Mistero di Cristo, p. 264-265.

In those words of the 4th Lateran Council: "One and the same Jesus Christ is priest and victim, whose Body and Blood are truly contained in this sacrament of the Altar", it is certainly taught that Christ is as truly and fully priest of the Sacrifice as He is Victim. But He is personally, immediately, and actually the Victim. Therefore, He is Priest in the same direct way.

The Council of Trent teaches: "The selfsame Jesus Christ *now offers Himself*, who offered Himself then on the Cross." Again, if we take these words in their obvious meaning, we must surely understand them in the sense of immediate, actual oblation on Christ's part. The context only confirms this persuasion. The Council states: "One and the same is the Victim, one and the same now offering Himself". He is as really and actually Priest as He is Victim of the Sacrifice. The Council further points out the subordinate rôle of the priest of the Church: Christ offers "by the ministry of the priests". They minister to Christ offering, but He is the principal Offerer of the Sacrifice. Finally, the Council teaches that the Sacrifices of the Cross and the Mass "differ only in the manner of offering". The Victim is now immolated unbloodily, and the oblation is now made not by Christ alone, as on the Cross, but together with the priests, His subordinates. As far as the *oblation* of the Sacrifice is concerned, there is a tremendous difference between an actual, personal oblation made by Christ, and a merely virtual, mediate oblation. Now, since the Council was dealing *ex professo* with the Priest of the Sacrifice, and the relation of the Mass to the Cross under that aspect, surely it would have expressly indicated the vastly different ways in which Christ made the oblation of Calvary, and now makes the oblation of the Mass, if it held the former to be true of the Cross but only the latter to be true of the Mass. The Council does not do so. Its obvious teaching is that Christ offers Himself in the Mass not less actually and personally than on the Cross. And that was the teaching of the great majority of the Fathers of the Council, who spoke on this matter in the discussions preceding the formulation of the Decree.¹³

Pope Leo XIII definitely seems to support this teaching when he proclaims that in the Holy Eucharist "*Christ Himself* is present and lives, and there indulges to the utmost His love for us, and under the impulse of that divine love ceaselessly renews His Sacrifice".¹⁴ That is quite opposed to the teaching of those who maintain that the Church

¹³Cf. M. Lepin, *L'idée du Sacrifice de la Messe* (1926) pp. 675 ff; 713, 745 ff. A work that is a monument to Fr. Lepin's patience as well as to his scholarship.

alone, not Christ, renews the offering of Calvary's Sacrifice in the Mass. The Pontiff says that Christ as personally and actually renews the Sacrifice of the Cross on our altars as He is personally and actually present on our altars.

Pope Pius XI gives us the same unqualified teaching when he writes: "Christ, the priest, Himself offered Himself a Victim for sins, and *perpetually offers Himself*".¹⁵ There is no indication that our High Priest offers Himself in the Mass less personally, immediately and formally than He did on the Cross.

Pope Pius XII, commenting on the Decree of the Council of Trent, clearly expresses this more common persuasion of the theologians when He observes: "The august Sacrifice of the altar is therefore no mere simple commemoration of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ; it is truly and properly the enacting of a sacrifice, wherein by an unbloody immolation *the High Priest does what He had already done on the Cross, offering Himself to the Eternal Father as a most acceptable victim*".¹⁶ Again, and yet more emphatically, does the Pontiff insist on this teaching when, having proclaimed that Christ the Priest offered Himself as a victim of expiation while hanging on the Cross, he continues thus: "*Precisely the same thing takes place in the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, which is the unbloody renewal of the sacrifice of the Cross: *Christ offers Himself to the Eternal Father* for His glory and for our salvation. And insofar as He, Priest and Victim, operates as Head of the Church, He offers and immolates not only Himself, but all Christians and in a certain manner all men as well".¹⁷

The Supreme Pontiffs, in their Encyclicals, do not speak metaphorically or rhetorically when treating points of Dogma. They employ cautious and guarded terminology lest the faithful fall into the snares of error. The obvious and natural meaning of their statements on this matter is found in the teaching of actual, personal oblation of the Sacrifice by Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, whose oblation is united with His and thus becomes perfectly pleasing to God. Hence the Church professes in the Mass: "*Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso, est Tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti, in unitate Spiritus Sancti, omnis honor et gloria*".

b) *From Sacred Scripture.*

While freely admitting that this teaching is not explicitly found in Sacred Scripture, yet it seems to us that it is implicitly contained therein.

¹⁴Encyc. *Mirae Charitatis*, 1902.

¹⁵Encyc. *Quas Primas*, 1925; DB. 2195.

¹⁶Encyc. *Mediator Dei*, 1947; Acta A.S. 1947, p. 548.

¹⁷Encyc. *Menti Nostrae*, 1950; Acta A.S. 1950, p. 666.

For example, it seems to us that in this teaching alone do we find fully verified the sublime prophecy of Malachias, according to which the Sacrifice of the Mass is always *the spotless Sacrifice*, supremely pleasing to God and in every respect acceptable to Him. Now, from the context of that prophecy, in which Almighty God severely reprimands the priests of the Jewish sacrifices, both on account of their own want of good dispositions in offering the sacrifices and on the score of unworthy, polluted victims offered by them, it is abundantly evident that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the spotless, ever-pleasing Sacrifice, both on the part of the Victim offered and on the part of the Offerer of the Sacrifice. Now, we do not see how this is fully verified unless Christ, the spotless High Priest, actually and personally makes the oblation. An excommunicated priest, or a priest in the state of mortal sin, validly offers this Sacrifice; and if he is the only immediate offerer, we have a horrifying, sacrilegious oblation. Similarly, a priest who is in good dispositions may be distracted at the solemn moment to the extent that his oblation is not an actual intention at all, but only a virtual one. If he, then, is the only immediate offerer, there is *no actual oblation* of the Sacrifice, whether internal or external.

How may one admit such unworthiness, imperfection, and shortcoming in the perfectly Clean Oblation so magnificently described by the mouth of the prophet? But, given that Christ the High Priest actually, immediately and personally makes the oblation of every Sacrifice, we see the prophecy wonderfully fulfilled. Then, indeed, it is the Clean Oblation which cannot be stained or polluted by the malice, unworthiness, or weakness of men.

Again, Christ is "a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech". His priesthood is essentially related to the Sacrifice of the Mass, prefigured in the sacrifice of Melchisedech. Hence, He must absolutely be the principal Offerer of every Mass that is celebrated on earth to the end of time. Now, the full truth of that revelation does not appear fulfilled if Christ our Lord *perpetually abstains from any actual use* of His Priesthood according to the order of Melchisedech, when there is no apparent reason why He should abstain; on the contrary, the glory of God, the perfection of Christian worship, and the good of His Church, all demand that He *actually* exercise His eternal priesthood in the noblest act of the Christian religion, the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. There is something repugnant in the concept of a High Priest (who can actually exercise His priesthood by making the personal and immediate oblation of sacrifice) perpetually delegating His ministers and

subordinates to act on His behalf, perpetually refraining from the noblest act of His priesthood, the offering of sacrifice. Indeed, it becomes more and more difficult to see how such a High Priest may truly be said to be the Principal Priest of each and every Sacrifice offered. Rather does He seem to vacate His principality, and hand over to other priests, who alone immediately offer, the chief work of priesthood. It would all be a strange anomaly in Christ our Lord, who, as the Apostle says, is such a High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech that He has neither an equal nor a successor.

Thirdly, Sacred Scripture also asserts that Christ, *precisely as our High Priest*, is ever living as our mediator with the Father, "ever living to make intercession for us". Hebrews, 7, 17-25! Romans, 8, 34). His priestly activities did not cease with His glorious ascension, but are forever exercised on our behalf. Unceasingly does He offer to the Father His whole humanity, and, with it, profound adoration, reparation, and thanksgiving. Unceasingly does He pray and intercede for us, as our High Priest: "Orat pro nobis, ut sacerdos noster", as St. Augustine teaches.¹⁸ All this Christ the Priest does *actually, personally, and formally*.

Now, perfect priestly intercession is had when the priest fulfils his perfect priestly office; that is, when he *offers sacrifice*. And a priest who acts forever "according to the order of Melchisedech" perfectly intercedes when he offers the clean oblation, the Mass, that was prefigured in the sacrifice of Melchisedech. Hence, Christ the Priest, continually, actually, and formally exercises His Melchisedechan Priesthood by making the actual oblation of Himself in every Mass.

There should be no difficulty in admitting all this. If Christ the Priest actually offers and dedicates His whole humanity to God the Father in Heaven, where is the difficulty in His making the actual oblation of His humanity sacramentally immolated upon our altars? We find it utterly incredible that Christ our Lord, having voluntarily become the victim of the Sacrifice, and having had Himself placed in a state of sacrificial immolation, and being a fully conscious victim with His whole intellect and will completely dedicated to God, His Father—should then remain completely passive, not making the actual oblation of Himself; and yet He is the principal Priest of the sacrifice. This we find incredible.

(To be continued.)

THOMAS MULDOON.

¹⁸Enarratio in Ps. 85, n. 1.

Moral Theology

ABSOLUTION OF THE DYING AND PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A few years ago, a Catholic woman, whom we shall call Mrs. X, went through the form of Marriage with a non-Catholic, in the presence of a Protestant Minister. She is afflicted with some heart trouble, but usually is not dangerously ill. Her attitude at all times is that she has done no wrong in attempting Marriage as she did. One day, when suffering from an acute attack, she agrees to go to confession. What is the confessor to do, if he finds that, though apparently dying, she still refuses to acknowledge her guilt or to promise amendment in the event of her recovery? Must he refuse her absolution?

COUNTRY PASTOR.

REPLY.

According to ordinary standards, it would seem that Mrs. X is either obstinate in her refusal to acknowledge her guilt and to take measures to rectify the sinful condition in which she has placed herself, or she is culpably ignorant. In one case or the other, she is indisposed for absolution. Should the priest, whose duty it is to care for the salvation of Mrs. X, have reason to conclude that she cannot be judged by ordinary standards, but is in fact invincibly ignorant, he may absolve her *in periculo mortis*.

The dispositions necessary for the reception of the sacrament of Penance are required irrespective of whether the penitent is in danger of death. According to a widely accepted opinion, the sorrowful manifestation of sin (*dolorosa confessio*) is the matter of the Sacrament; and according to the teaching of the Church, the absolution would be invalid if the person to whom it were given had not supernatural sorrow for his transgressions, and at least attrition for mortal sin. Sorrow for sin always includes a purpose of amendment; and one who will not promise to abandon a life of habitual sin—as in the instance of Mrs. X—certainly has no contrition of any kind and is not a subject for valid absolution. There is an inclination to be charitable and presume that a person in danger of death is sorry for having offended God, but this presumption is not necessarily true. It is unfortunately possible for a sinner to persist in a state of enmity with God, even to the last moment,

and to die impenitent. Divine grace must be accepted freely, and those who reject it will have to suffer the consequences in eternity. To administer the Sacraments to one who is manifestly unworthy would only add the guilt of sacrilege to the weight of present sins. Mrs. X has been told repeatedly by the Priest of the gravity of her obligations; she refuses to fulfil them, and so it is beyond the power of priestly ministrations to restore her to the friendship of God. It may be said that she is ignorant and in good faith. If after due instructions, she persists that she has done no wrong and refuses to rectify her condition, the only reasonable conclusion is that she deliberately rejects the authority of the Church; she will not accept what she is taught because she does not wish to do so. Her ignorance is therefore culpable, and she must be held responsible for its effects. It is clear that as long as this attitude remains, she cannot be admitted to the Sacraments.

While all this is true, every priest has had experience of people who, because of lack of natural intelligence or want of early education, cannot be taught anything which runs counter to their own preconceived ideas of right and wrong. Admittedly, such men and women are exceptional, as most will accept without question the word of their Pastor on matters affecting their religious obligations. The Sacrament of Penance is administered in the internal forum, and so the confessor is to judge the sins according to the conscience of the penitent. If he finds his penitent has a false conscience, he is generally bound to instruct him and to elicit a promise that his admonitions will be put into effect. But if he foresees that his instructions will be the occasion, when everything is considered, of more harm than good, he should omit them altogether or abstain from insisting on them. When dealing with a normal person who had entered an irregular matrimonial union, as had Mrs. X, the confessor would conclude that ignorance would yield to instruction; and even if the opposite were conjectured, the public good would demand that practical steps be already taken to end the present mode of life, either by separation or canonical marriage, before absolution was given. Likewise, outside danger of death, he should not absolve one who, for the reasons mentioned above, could not be convinced of the sinfulness of marriage attempted contrary to the laws of the Church. To do so would only confirm the delinquent in his ignorance, and be the occasion of serious scandal. Furthermore, there is a chance that with time and patience he may be led to see the truth, and in due course be prepared to fulfil his obligations. When death appears imminent, how-

ever, there is no opportunity for further discussion: the person is in good faith and no good purpose would be served by insistence on what he cannot be persuaded he is bound to perform. *Sacramenta propter homines*. We think absolution should be given, at least conditionally. The Priest who attends the patient will be the best judge as to whether the persistent ignorance is due to malice or plain stupidity. In the one case he will refuse absolution, in the other he will give it.

*

*

*

*

CO-OPERATION IN RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The question of assistance at so called Religious Services can be an awkward one for the Priest whose advice is sought. I do not refer merely to the presence of Catholics at non-Catholic Marriages, Funerals, etc., but also at what are known as United Services, which are held on the occasion of some national celebration, v.g., Anzac Day. I have heard it said that the recital in common of prayers, the singing of hymns and the reading of portions of the Scripture at such gatherings may be tolerated, provided the prayers and hymns do not contain unorthodox sentiments, and provided also the lead is taken by a layman, Catholic or Protestant, but not by a Minister of Religion.

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

We have several enquiries on hand concerning the lawfulness of joining in religious functions with non-Catholics. An endeavour has been made above to group all these questions, and thus it is hoped to meet the wishes of more than one correspondent by a single treatment of the subject. The matter of *Communicatio in sacris* with non-Catholics was discussed in the *A.C.R.*, October, 1946, but we feel sure that our readers will pardon a repetition of some of the principles which were there outlined.

Communicatio in sacris means joining with others in religious worship. This we do, with our co-religionists, not only when we attend the public services of the Church, but as often as we associate with one or more of them in any act of the virtue of religion, such as v.g. the recitation of the family Rosary. If those with whom we are united in performing an action of divine worship be not members of the Catholic Church, but profess themselves to be Christians, we communi-

cate *in sacris* with heretics. If the sacred actions are part of true Catholic worship, whether private or public, there is no objection to the presence of non-Catholics, provided they take no active part in a public religious ceremony, but attend as members of the congregation or even conform their activities to those of the faithful who assist at the Mass or other divine office. But when we refer to joining in worship with non-Catholics, we usually have in mind not their association with us, but our taking part in the services of their religious affiliation. This is, of course, usually forbidden both by the natural law and the positive enactments of the Church. The reason for the prohibition is that it frequently implies a danger to the Faith of a Catholic, it is a source of scandal and an act of disloyalty to the true Church to which we are privileged to belong, and it is an implicit approval of a form of worship which is in contradiction to that established by our Divine Lord or, on his authority, by the Church.

It may be asked: when is religious worship considered heretical? When have we the *sacra heretica* in which it is forbidden to Catholics to have any part? In reply, we may state that religious worship is heretical (a) by its very nature, when it is the outward manifestation of heretical doctrine. Such would be the Communion Service which is a denial of the sacrificial character of the Mass, and such would be the devout recital even in private of the profession of faith of some non-Catholic sect. Further, (b) religious worship must be always considered heretical when conducted by a Minister of Religion, acting as such. His assumption of the position of an official Religious Leader is an open profession of his heresy, and according to the old axiom, *actio sequitur esse*, he is acting as a heretic whenever he conducts any religious service, though he may merely read some selection from Sacred Scripture or recite prayers which are in daily use also among Catholics. As a private person, he does not differ from others who are not members of the Catholic Church, but when he acts in his official capacity, his simplest "service" is what we call *sacrum hereticum*.

Let us put the matter briefly: To take part, whether publicly or privately, in any religious action which is based on the profession of false doctrine, is communication *in sacris hereticis*. A "service" conducted by the Minister of a non-Catholic religious body implies, objectively at least, a denial that the sacerdotal power was entrusted by Christ to the exclusive care of the Church He founded. So it follows that attendance at such services is likewise communication *in sacris hereticis*.

It is evident that no circumstances will excuse active participation in religious worship which is expressly or implicitly a rejection of revealed truth or of the divine authority of the Church. With regard to passive assistance, which means mere presence without joining in the act of non-Catholic worship, such participation is generally forbidden for the reasons mentioned above (danger of perversion, scandal, etc.), but it is not intrinsically evil, and provided the dangers associated with it are reduced to a minimum and there be sufficient reason, it may be tolerated. Thus the Code (can. 1258, p. 2) legislates: "Passive or mere material presence, by reason of civil duty or for the sake of civil honour, can be tolerated for a serious reason, which is to be approved by the Bishop in case of doubt, at non-Catholic funerals, marriages, and other similar functions, provided there is no danger of perversion or scandal". From a practical point of view, there is usually not much difficulty; and individuals who are under some compulsion to appear at such functions as are exemplified in the canon quoted can be told by the Priest that they may do so, but to take no part in the prayers or in any other way to join in the service.

The second point raised in the query concerns participation in United Services. If these are led or conducted by a Minister of Religion, it is our firm conviction that they are *sacra acatholicorum*, and it is forbidden to recite the prayers or sing the hymns which go to make up the service, even though formulae used are in themselves free from erroneous doctrine. Further, we are of opinion that, risk of perversion apart, the presence of a large number of Catholic representatives, v.g. the Catholic ex-service men of a particular district, at such services is not justified. It seems that two of the conditions laid down in canon 1258, p. 2, are not verified: there is no serious cause (official duty, etc.) demanding the mass attendance of Catholics at such gatherings, and there is no slight danger of scandal. Those who would assume it a civic duty for Catholics to be present at a United Service are mistaken concerning the religious freedom which is the right of every citizen of Australia. It is unfortunate that differences exist among us on matters of Religion; we have to accept these differences as a fact, but they in no way hinder our undivided unity in our loyalty to our Country and in the fulfilment of all our duties for the general welfare of the community. A national festivity, such as the commemoration on Anzac Day is one in which all citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs, should be able to take their part. If the various sections of the community feel that

there should be some religious celebration, let it be such that violence is done to no man's conscience. Since on matters of religious belief and ceremonial we are divided, why should there be a "United Service"? Thus we maintain that no reason can be brought forward under the heading of civic duty or purely civil honour to those who fought and died for the defence of our Country, or to their surviving relatives, which would justify even material and passive attendance at such religious functions. Those of our co-religionists who are numbered among the dead would not wish for a remembrance which entails a transgression of the commands of Mother Church. Moreover, one refuses to believe that our non-Catholic neighbours would expect us to honour their dead in a manner which offends our conscience. They know we have piously remembered our debt to the departed in our own way, and that we join wholeheartedly in every endeavour to consolidate the results of the sacrifices of the brave. Then comes the question of scandal, which means providing an occasion for evil. When persons of every shade of religious belief join together for worship, it is an easy step to the conclusion that there is really no real difference between them, and that one religion is just the same as another—thus giving rise to indifference in religious matters, which is one of the evils of the day.

The last item referred to in the query under discussion would appear to be a compromise: The prayers, hymns, etc., are all orthodox, and the function is conducted by a lay-man; therefore there is no religious service in the technical sense, the whole ceremony is of a private nature, and Catholics and non-Catholics can join without offence to the most conscientious. *Utinam!*

To join with non-Catholics in private prayer is obviously not evil; there are occasions when it would be commendable. No one scruples to recite grace at the table where persons of different religious convictions partake of the same meal. Catholic nurses and others who attend the sick and dying, discharge a duty of charity if they suggest prayers to inspire patience in suffering and sorrow for sin as a preparation for the judgment which will follow death. There is evidently no parallel between such communication *in sacris* with non-Catholics and that which is proposed for some public celebration. In one case the prayers are genuinely of a private nature and do not depart from the norms of private devotion sanctioned by the Church. But an assembly of all classes of citizens for the performance of a form of worship acceptable to the members of every religious body, leaving out what is specifically

.

Catholic or distinctly Protestant seems to us to be an attempt to hold public worship which is contrary to the traditional manner of honouring the Almighty, has not the consent and approbation of the Bishop and so goes against the spirit of canon 1261. This canon reads: "Ordinaries of places must be watchful that the provisions of the sacred canons regarding divine worship be sedulously observed, and especially that, in the divine worship, whether in public or private, or in the daily life of the faithful, no superstitious practice be introduced, and that nothing be admitted which is foreign to the faith, or out of harmony with ecclesiastical tradition. . . ." One may argue that because these prayers, hymns, etc., are not offered in the name of the Church or by persons who are or claim to be lawfully deputed to act as representatives of the Church, therefore they remain private devotions, and provided they contain nothing objectionable to the faith, they may be tolerated. In reply we remark that they fail by defect in that they omit what should be expressed and can easily lead to the impression that what has been omitted is of no consequence. Could a Catholic approve of a religious celebration on Anzac Day without prayer for the dead? Another observation is that the generality of men will regard the meeting as a religious ceremony: it is not Catholic and therefore it is non-Catholic—a *sacrum acatholicorum* in which we are forbidden to participate. Though some non-Catholics may regard it as an unofficial service, because of the absence of a clergyman, many others are not so minded, for they do not consider the presence of a Minister of Religion as necessary, and go so far as to deny any special prerogative in spiritual matters to the clergy of any denomination. For these, the meeting with prayers is a true religious service in every sense, and the Catholics who join with them, we think, will find it difficult to persuade themselves they are not taking part in a form of worship which is a *sacrum acatholicum*, and is actually considered such by many of those associated with it. We will not stress the point that the formulae of the prayers would usually be those which are in common use among non-Catholics, and while they do not contain false doctrine, by reason of their associations, are unacceptable to Catholics and are not according to the form approved for use by Ecclesiastical authority. (cf. can. 1259, par. 1.). These will be sufficient reasons for our opinion that acts of worship performed in public by persons of all religious beliefs are not permitted to Catholics.

In conclusion we would make two observations:

- a) It is possible that not all will agree entirely with the strict stand

we have adopted in answering the above query. We believe, however, that in a matter which involves a danger to the Faith or is likely to lessen the deep appreciation for it in the minds of the faithful, the practical policy is: *Pars tutior est sequenda*.

b) Circumstances affecting the scandal likely to arise and the reasons which would permit passive assistance at non-Catholic religious services, differ from place to place. In the last resort, the judgment of what may be permitted rests with the local Ordinary.

JAMES MADDEN.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

PRAYER IN FAITH, by Janet Erskine Stuart. Sands, 1951, 276pp. 12/6 (Eng.).
POEMS, by Janet Erskine Stuart. Sands, 1951, 58 pp., 6/- (Eng.).

Both of these books are reprints, the Poems being published in 1924, the other in 1936. As they were given a good reception on their first publication, there is no reason to suppose that they will not find a new generation of appreciative readers. The poems may find a more prosaic world than that to which they opened their eyes nearly thirty years ago. Much modern poetry being unintelligible, readers have fallen back from poetry, baffled, and scornful of the whole race of poets. This is their loss, for there is much good poetry being written in traditional metrical forms. The name of de la Mare comes to mind. Mother Stuart's poems are not only interesting in form; they have, besides this, the deep spiritual insight of a writer who lived on a high plane of prayer and sacrifice.

The book, *Prayer in Faith*, is a store of beautiful thoughts on Scripture and the Liturgy. Active people who find nourishment for their spiritual life in discursive meditations should find this book very helpful—this recommendation applies also to people in the lay apostolate. If we do not lead these apostolic souls to meditation on the Gospels, we are doing them an injustice. To obtain any benefit, however, from such a book as this, they will need some spiritual training. Perhaps, it will be active Religious who will give them the warmest welcome. Mother Stuart's own prayerful life has left its imprint on every page, and under her guidance readers should be led to find for themselves sustenance in the pleasant fields of Scripture.

M.O.

Canon Law

I. PARISH PRIEST IN TWO DIOCESES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The parish of X is at the extremity of this diocese and adjoins the parish of Y in the neighbouring diocese. Some small towns of the parish of Y are located much nearer to the parish church of X than to that of Y. Apart from one Sunday of the month, when Mass is said in one of these places, their people attend Sunday Mass at X, which is also their civic centre. By friendly arrangement, the pastor of X attends most of the sick-calls in these towns.

A proposal has been made that these districts be brought under the jurisdiction of the pastor of X. They have too few Catholic inhabitants to support the upkeep of a parochial centre. However, it has been suggested that they could be formed into a parish, on the understanding that the pastor of X would be the pastor of the new parish as well. Alternatively, if there is some difficulty about being pastor in two dioceses, the pastor of X could be the administrator of the districts in question, whether they are formed into a new parish or not. Would either of these arrangements be in accordance with canon law? Needless to say, the change would seem to contribute considerably to the good of souls.

RUSTICUS.

REPLY.

Neither of these proposals seems to be contemplated by Canon Law. Provision is made for the pastor of one parish to have the administration of one or more parishes besides. But the law seems to take for granted that all such parishes are within the one diocese and that the pastoral ministry is exercised in them under the jurisdiction of the one Local Ordinary.

In Canon Law each diocese is an independent unit, with its own proper Ordinary. The laws concerning incardination of clerics into a diocese bear out this concept of the diocese as the unit of ecclesiastical administration.

On the other hand, the law provides its own remedies for such situations. Canon 476 provides for the appointment of assistants to the pastor: Canon 1427 provides for the division or dismembration of a parish. Apparently neither remedy is applicable in the present case.

But there seems to be good reason for considering a modification of diocesan boundaries. If the Ordinaries of the two dioceses agree upon such a change, they must submit the request to the Holy See.

*

*

*

*

2. DISPENSATION FROM MIXED RELIGION—CATHOLIC UPBRINGING OF CHILDREN ALREADY BORN.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I would appreciate your answering the following question:—John, a Catholic, goes through a form of marriage with Mary, a non-Catholic, in the Protestant Church. Two children are born of the union and have now reached the ages of eight and six. A priest interviews and arranges to have the marriage re-validated. A dispensation is obtained. The question is—has John any obligation to the Catholic upbringing of the children born of this invalid union, or do his obligations arise from the “new marriage,” that is, concerning the future children?

JAM NATUS.

REPLY.

John has grave obligations in regard to the Catholic upbringing of all his children, both those already born, and those yet to be born. There is no room for doubt on this score. The obligation arises from the Divine Law itself. However, the guarantees required of John and Mary, as a necessary condition to the granting of a dispensation from Mixed Religion, are concerned only with the Catholic upbringing of offspring yet to be born. In granting such a dispensation to John, the Ordinary would warn him of his obligations, under Divine Law, to procure by every prudent means the Catholic upbringing of his two children, aged eight and six years respectively.

In Canon 1061, paragraph 1, certain requirements are laid down in order that the Church may dispense from the impediment of Mixed Religion. “The Church does not dispense from the impediment of Mixed Religion unless: (i) there are just and grave reasons therefor; (ii) the non-Catholic party shall have given a guarantee to remove all danger of perversion from the Catholic party, and both parties shall have given guarantees to baptise and educate all the children (*de universa prole*) in the Catholic faith alone; (iii) there exists moral certainty that the guarantees will be fulfilled.” The words, “*de universa prole*” were the subject of a reply of the Holy Office, issued 16th January, 1942. Doubts had arisen as to the extent of the guarantees required when children (minors) were living who had been born to one or both of the

parties previously ; for example, from a former valid marriage of which the other partner had died, or from a former invalid, or putative, marriage. Divergent views were propounded by Canonists, some contending that the guarantees must apply to such children as well as to those yet to be born. Some, again, upheld a more restricted view, for example, Gasparri would require that the promises extend to all children already born who had not yet reached the age of reason. It was to resolve such doubt that the following question was proposed to the Holy Office :

1. Whether promises, which must be given according to Canon 1061, to have all children baptised and educated only in the Catholic Church, include only children to be born or also children already born before the marriage.

Reply: In the affirmative to the first part ; in the negative to the second part.

2. What is to be thought of marriages celebrated with promises only as to future children without mention of children already born ?

Reply: This is provided for in the reply to the first question. The mind (*mens*) of the Sacred Congregation is then explained. Although *per se*, according to the Canon cited, promises are not required as regards children already born before the celebration of marriage, yet the parties to the marriage are by all means to be warned of their grave obligation under the Divine Law to see to the Catholic education also of children who are already born.

*

*

*

*

3. SUSPENSION LATÆ SENTENTIAE ATTACHED TO A PRECEPT.

Dear Reverend Sir,

John, a priest, is warned solemnly by his Bishop against a certain action, under pain of incurring *ipso facto* suspension *a divinis*. While travelling in another diocese, John contravenes this precept, and being truly repentant, he is seeking absolution from the censure incurred. May he be absolved by a priest of that diocese, or is the suspension so reserved to his own Bishop that it may be absolved only by the Bishop or by some priest specially deputed by the Bishop. I am assuming that the censure had been incurred, even though the Bishop's command was violated in another diocese.

SENEX.

REPLY.

The assumption that the censure has been incurred, although the infringement took place outside the diocese of the Ordinary who issued the precept, is correct. A precept is personal in character, not territorial; it binds a subject wherever he goes.

The other query of SENEX, concerning the reservation of the censure, opens up the way to a question much discussed by Canonists. In practice, one may act upon a more favourable view, that the penalty is not reserved, and that absolution may be given by the priest of the other diocese. Though there is not universal support for this view, it is founded upon strong arguments and is supported by Canonists of repute.

The law states clearly enough that a censure is reserved in two cases—firstly, when it is stated explicitly that the censure is reserved, and secondly, when the censure is “*ab homine*”. In the case under consideration, it appears that an explicit reservation has not been made. It remains to be asked whether the suspension in question is to be considered as a censure *ab homine*.

In Canon 2217, paragraph 1, No. 3, a censure is classified as being *ab homine* if it is imposed by way of a particular precept (*si feratur per modum praecepti peculiaris*), or by a judicial condemnatory sentence (even though it be established by the law). The question to be asked is whether the censure of our query is to be classified as “imposed by way of a particular precept”. For a censure may be attached to a precept in two different ways. Firstly, the precept may contain a command such that if it is not observed, a censure will be incurred *ipso facto*; the precept contains the threat of a censure. Secondly, a censure may be inflicted actually by means of a precept, instead of by a judicial sentence; the inflicting of the censure has not been at the conclusion of a formal process. In this case the censure is not merely *threatened*, it is *established* by the precept. The question at issue resolves itself into this position: Does the expression, “If it is imposed by way of a particular precept”, include only the latter type of precept, or does it include also the former type, in which the present case is included.

To assemble arguments for and against in this controversy is a formidable task. However, it may be recorded that such authors as Roberti, Michiels, Creusen favour the opinion that only those precepts which establish a censure are included under the heading of censures *ab homine*, and therefore are reserved. As to the arguments arrayed in favour of this opinion, the following are typical:

Examining closely the terms of Canon 2217, paragraph 1, No. 3, it will be observed that a parity is established between a censure "imposed by way of a particular precept", and a judicial sentence by which punishment is inflicted at the end of a formal trial. The terms of this parity suggest that the precept in question also has been the medium of inflicting a censure. Again, in Canon 2245, paragraph 2, it is laid down that censures *ab homine* are reserved to the one who inflicted the censure (*censuram infligit*), or passed sentence (*sententiam tulit*), or to his competent superior, successor or delegate. This contrast of "*censuram infligit*" and "*sententiam tulit*" refers clearly to the contrast of Canon 2217, paragraph 1, No. 3, between "imposed by way of a particular precept" and "imposed by a judicial sentence, etc." Therefore, the precept in question, in Canon 2217, paragraph 1, No. 3, is also the precept by which a penalty is inflicted, not one by which a censure is merely threatened.

The Confessor of John may be advised that the censure in question is not reserved.

*

*

*

*

4. OCCASIONAL CONFESSORS OF RELIGIOUS WOMEN— WHERE MAY CONFESSION BE HEARD.

Dear Reverend Sir,

Although the question of Occasional Confessors of religious women has been treated on different occasions in the *Record*, I find that a certain amount of confusion exists as to what was the final outcome of the doubts and replies. To put it in a nutshell—I have not faculties to hear Confessions of religious women. If I am approached by a sister who wishes to make Confession for the peace of her conscience, I may hear her Confession in a confessional; but may I do so in the Sacristy, or in the Convent parlour? Without the need to cover ground which has been covered before, might I ask for a brief reply?

JUVENIS.

REPLY.

Brief reply may be made to the query of JUVENIS as follows:—

According to Canon 910, 1, confessions of women (even secular) should be heard in the confessional, unless another place is chosen by reason of sickness, or for some other real necessity, suitable precautions being taken according to the judgment of the Ordinary. Now, briefly, whenever some "real necessity" would make it lawful for the confession

of a secular woman to be heard in a Sacristy or in a parlour, it would also be a situation in which an Occasional Confessor might hear validly the confession of a sister in the sacristy or in the Convent parlour.

The suggestion of JUVENIS not to cover ground which has been covered already in earlier issues of the *A.C. Record* is appreciated. For the sake of completeness, however, a brief resume of canonical developments in this matter of Occasional Confessors of Religious Women is appended herewith.

Canon 522—"If, notwithstanding the provisions of Canon 520, 521 (Ordinary, Special, Extraordinary, Supplementary Confessors), a religious (sister), for the peace of her conscience, goes to a Confessor approved by the Ordinary for hearing Confessions of women, her Confession, made in any church or oratory, even semi-public, is valid and lawful, any privilege to the contrary being hereby revoked; the Superioress may not forbid this, nor make enquiries concerning it, even indirectly, nor is such a religious bound to make any report on it to the Superioress".

In the interpretation of this law the question of greatest importance concerns the *place* of the Confession. Eventually two conclusions emerged from the discussions and replies, firstly, that the requirements of place are a condition for the validity of the Confession, secondly, that the correct place may be not only a church or oratory, but, also, any place designated for the confessions of women generally, even in individual instances, in accordance with Canon 910, par. 1.

Regarding the first conclusion an official reply was issued by the Code Commission, 24 November, 1920:

Whether the words of Canon 522: *Confessio in qualibet ecclesia vel oratorio etiam semi-publico peracta, valida et licita est*, are to be understood in the sense that a confession outside of those places is not only illicit, but also invalid?

Reply—Canon 522 is to be understood in the sense that the confessions which religious women make for their peace of conscience to a confessor approved by the Ordinary of the place for the confessions of women, are licit and valid, provided they be made in a church or in an oratory, even semi-public, or in a place which is legitimately destined for the confessions of women".

Although this Reply made more ample provision in regard to the place suitable for such confessions, doubts remained as to whether a

confession heard outside the place determined in the Reply would be invalid.

A subsequent Reply issued 28th December, 1927, clarified this issue.

"Whether the confession of religious women outside the places mentioned in Canon 522 and the Reply of 4 Nov., 1920, is only illicit or also invalid".

Reply—In the negative to the first part, in the affirmative to the second part.

The second query concerning the place of these confessions arose from the amplification made in the Reply of 1920, "in a place which is legitimately destined for the confessions of women". Discussion ensued concerning the meaning of "legitimately". Had the place to be designated permanently, or could it be designated for the purpose in question in individual instances? Also, had it to be designated by the Ordinary, or could it be chosen by the superioress or by the confessor, and in what circumstances? A reply of the Code Commission, issued 12th February, 1935, declared that the words in question are to be understood not only of a place designated habitually, but also of a place chosen by way of act or chosen in accordance with the ruling of Canon 910, par. 1.

The "other real necessity" of Canon 910, 1, may be a moral necessity, as well as a physical one, and it may arise from various considerations.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

PRIVILEGED ALTAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

As I am anxious to have a privileged altar in my church, would you kindly indicate what is necessary for the obtaining of the privilege and any conditions that may govern its use?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

A privileged altar is one to which is attached a plenary indulgence, which is applicable to a person either by way of absolution, if the Mass is offered for a living person at an altar privileged *pro vivis*, or by way of suffrage, if the Mass is offered for a deceased person at an altar privileged *pro defunctis*. Altars may be privileged either for the living or for the dead, or for both, although the practice of the Church now seems to be to grant only the privilege for the dead. Some have thought that the restriction of Canon 930, that indulgences may not be transferred to another living person, excludes the possibility of an altar privileged for the living. However, in fact such privilege has been granted, nor does it involve the transfer of an indulgence to another living person. The Celebrant of the Mass does not first gain the indulgence and then apply it to another, but rather he offers the Holy Sacrifice by reason of which the plenary indulgence is granted and applied to the person for whom the Mass is offered. The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences gave the following description of the indulgence of the privileged altar: 'The indulgence attached to a privileged altar, according to the mind of the Church (concedentis) and the use of the Power of the Keys, must be understood as a plenary indulgence, which immediately delivers a soul from all the pains of Purgatory; but according to the effect of the application, must be taken to mean an indulgence which is proportionate to the good-pleasure and acceptance of the divine mercy' (28th July, 1840, Dec. auth. 283).

A privileged altar may be i) *local*, when the privilege is attached to the altar itself, and may be gained by any priest who celebrates Mass at the altar; ii) *personal*, when the privilege belongs to the priest himself and is gained wherever he says Mass; iii) *mixed*, when the privilege is attached to a certain altar for certain priests only, e.g., the members of some particular confraternity.

THE ALTAR. The altar to be privileged must conform to certain rules. It must be a *fixed* altar, not in the strict sense understood by the rubrics, but in the ordinary sense, as signifying a solid permanent structure. It need not be consecrated; it may be of wood. The privilege is not attached to the consecrated altar stone, consequently the stone may be exchanged for another without affecting the privilege of the altar. It is not necessary that the church be consecrated, sufficient that it be blessed. The altar should have its own titular, and in the case of the high altar, the principal titular will be the same as that of the church.

LOCAL PRIVILEGED ALTAR. The Code of Canon Law gives to Bishops, Abbots and Prelates *nullius*, Vicars and Prefects Apostolic, and major Superiors of exempt clerical religious the power to declare *one* altar privileged, daily and perpetually, in their cathedral, abbatial, collegiate, conventual, parochial, and quasi-parochial churches, provided that there is no such altar already established in the church. This faculty does not extend to semi-public oratories, unless they are united to or a subsidiary of a parochial church (c. 916). An oratory may be considered subsidiary to the parish church, if parochial functions, such as baptisms and funerals, are performed in it. The fact that a church already possesses an altar privileged for a certain group of persons does not prevent the Ordinary using the above faculty to erect an altar privileged for all the faithful.

Two further privileged altars are granted in common law. The Code states that on All Souls' Day, all Masses are privileged, as if they were celebrated at a privileged altar (c. 917, § 1). By Decree of the Sacred Penitentiary of the 31st October, 1934, this privileged was extended to all days within the 'octave' of All Souls' Day, i.e., until the 9th November inclusive (A.A.S. xxvi (1934), p. 606). During the celebration of the Forty Hours Prayer, even in the modified form, in any church, all the altars in the church are privileged (c. 917, § 2). Likewise, in churches in which there is continuous Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, even though interrupted during the night, for at least one month all altars are privileged each day (*Enchir. indulgent.*, 1950, n. 169 c).

PERSONAL PRIVILEGED ALTAR. This privilege belongs to the person of the priest, and is gained wherever he offers the Sacrifice of the Mass, even at a portable altar. The present common practice of the Church is to grant the privilege by Indult, to be used four times each week. Cardinals and Bishops are given by the Code personal privileged altars daily

(c. 239 and 349). Priests who make the Heroic Act enjoy a personal privileged altar daily (*Enchir. indulg.*, 1950, n. 593 b).

CONDITIONS FOR GAINING PRIVILEGE. In order to gain the benefit of the privilege the plenary indulgence of the privileged altar must be applied to the soul for whom the Mass is offered. Considered *speculatively* the Mass could be applied to one person and the indulgence to another. The offering of the Mass is the work prescribed for the gaining of the indulgence, and as such is distinct from the indulgence. However, *in practice* the two may not be separated, as the Church, upon Whose authority the granting of the indulgence depends, has several times declared that both Mass and indulgence must be applied to the same person. Moreover, when the Mass is offered for the dead, the indulgence of the privileged altar must be applied to *one* soul, even though the Mass may be offered for several souls (cfr. A.A.S., ix (1917), p. 440 ad lum). Following a Decree of the Holy Office, 20th Feb., 1913, it is no longer essential that a Requiem Mass, or a ferial or vigil Mass with the prayer for the dead added, be celebrated to gain the indulgence of the privileged altar, although this is the laudable practice to follow, when it is permissible and becoming to do so (cfr. A.A.S., v (1913), p. 122).

*

*

*

*

NECESSITY OF BEESWAX CANDLES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Wax candles are a big price. Just how necessary is it to use wax candles for Benediction? for the four extra candles, when six candles are used at Mass? for the two candles at a private Mass? for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament?

The blessing of candles always refers to wax, is there any sense in blessing tallow or sperm candles? Should unblessed candles be used at all?

PEREGRINUS.

REPLY.

The constant tradition of the Church has always been to use beeswax candles and olive oil for the lamps at the altar. Since the beginning of the century, however, it has become increasingly difficult to procure pure beeswax candles. Owing to the increased cost of beeswax, manufacturers began to substitute animal and vegetable fats, in part, at least, for beeswax. A Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, December 14th, 1904, declared that it was not necessary that candles should be pure

beeswax, but the Paschal Candle and the Candles used at Mass must be beeswax for the greater part. This decision has been incorporated in Decree 547 of the IVth Plenary Council of Australia, which stated that the Paschal Candle and the candles lighted at solemn and private Masses must be of beeswax, at least *in maxima parte*; other candles placed on the altar must be beeswax *in notabili parte*. The Council did not determine what percentages precisely of beeswax are required. A Provincial Council of Victoria (1907) laid down 65% and 25% respectively for the two types of candles, and this, too, is the norm adopted by the Hierarchy of England and Wales (cfr. *A.C.R.*, 1942, pp. 53-54; Murphy, *The Sacristan's Manual*, p. 9).

During the war the difficulty of obtaining wax candles became greater, and on the 13th March, 1942, the Sacred Congregation of Rites gave to Ordinaries the Faculty to reduce the number of wax candles required at the celebration of the sacred Offices, and to permit the substitution of other lights, even electric lights, to make up the prescribed number of candles (*A.A.S.* XXXIV (1942), p. 112). The relaxation was not intended to be more than temporary, for on the 18th August, 1949, a further Decree was issued, in which the Congregation determined the minimum number of beeswax candles necessary for the various sacred functions, due consideration having been given to the question of expense. The numbers required are: two beeswax candles for the celebration of private Masses, at least four for solemn or sung Masses, four, also, for solemn Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The extra numbers required at any of the functions may be made up with other lights. For the rest, the Ordinaries are exhorted to restore, as soon as possible, the age-old tradition of the Church (*A.A.S.* XLI (1949), pp. 476-477).

The *Formula Maior* gives to the Australian Bishops the Faculty to permit the celebration of Mass with one light, of any kind, provided that there are no beeswax candles available; and even, in cases of real necessity, to permit its celebration without any lights (n. 5). For a just cause, our Bishops may allow Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament with two lights of any kind, not, however, continuous Exposition or the Exposition of the Forty Hours (n. 13).

PEREGRINUS, therefore, must consult his Local Ordinary in order to know the number of beeswax candles, if any, he must use in the various cases mentioned above.

As regards the blessing of candles, it is not necessary to bless them at all, not even those used at Mass, although it is fitting to do so as they

thus become Sacramentals, the efficacy of which is *ex opere operantis Ecclesiae*, inasmuch as the Church is holy and acts in the closest union with her Head' (*Encycl. 'Mediator Dei'*, English C.T.S., pp. 19-20). From the fact that the Church tolerates and requires, in case of necessity, any kind of light as better than nothing, it could be deduced that She does not regard the symbolical value of the lights as being wholly dependent upon the nature of the source of the light. Light has its own proper symbolism, whether it be the light of a beeswax or a tallow candle, or even an electric light. The light that dispels the natural darkness is a ready symbol of Him Who is 'the light of the world', 'the true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world'. Consequently, the formula for the Blessing of candles contained in the Roman Ritual (Tit. viii, cap. 3) does not appear to be incongruous, even though the candles are made of tallow and not beeswax.

*

*

*

*

ADDITIONS TO THE ROMAN MARTYROLOGY.

A Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of the 9th May, 1952 (*A.A.S.*, xxxiv (1952), pp. 489-493), published a list of *elogia* of Saints recently canonized and of Patrons newly appointed to be inserted in the Roman Martyrology.

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| January 31st. | St. Francis Xavier Bianchi, Confessor (canonized 21st October, 1951). |
| February 2nd. | St. Joan de Lestonnac, Widow. Foundress of the Institute of the Daughters of the blessed Virgin Mary (canonized 15th May, 1949). |
| February 4th. | St. Joan of Valois, Queen of France. Foundress of the Order of the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary (canonized 28th May, 1950). |
| May 11th. | St. Ignatius di Laconi, Confessor (canonized 21st June, 1951). |
| May 14th. | St. Mary Dominica Mazzarello, Virgin. Co-foundress of the Daughters of Mary Help of Christians (canonized 24th June, 1951). |
| May 26th. | St. Mary Anne of Jesus de Paredes, Virgin (canonized 9th July, 1950). |
| June 7th. | St. Anthony Mary Gianelli, Bishop of Bobbio. Founder of the Congregation of the Daughters of Holy Mary dell' Orto (canonized 21st October, 1951). |

June 28th.	St. Vincentia Gerosa, Virgin. Co-foundress of the Institute of the Sisters of Charity (canonized 18th May, 1951).
July 6th.	St. Maria Goretti, Virgin and Martyr (canonized 24th June, 1950).
July 26th.	St. Bartholomea Capitanio, Virgin. Foundress of the Institute of the Sisters of Charity (canonized 18th May, 1951).
August 24th.	St. Emily de Vialar, Virgin. Foundress of the Institute of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition (canonized 24th June, 1951).
September 19th.	St. Mary Wilhelma Emily de Rodat, Virgin. Foundress of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Family (canonized 23rd April, 1950).
September 25th.	St. Vincent Mary Strambi, Bishop of Macerata and Tolentino (canonized 11th June, 1950).
October 3rd.	St. Mary Josepha Rossello. Virgin. Foundress of the Intsitute of the Daughters of Our Lady of Mercy (canonized 12th June, 1949).
October 24th.	St. Anthony Mary Claret, one time Archbishop of Santiago in Cuba. Founder of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary (canonized 7th May, 1950).

St. John Baptist de La Salle (7th April) has been appointed principal Patron of all Teachers of boys and youths.

St. Michael the Archangel (8th May) has been appointed Patron and Protector of Radiologists and Radiotherapeutists.

St. Alphonsus Ligouri (1st August) has been appointed Patron of all confessors and moralists.

St. Joseph Calasanctius (25th August) has been appointed Patron of all schools for children of the people.

St. Albert the Great (15th November) has been appointed Patron of those who cultivate the natural sciences.

St. Frances Xaveria Cabrini (22nd December) has been appointed Patron of all emigrants.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

THE PARABLE OF THE BARREN FIG-TREE.

The preaching of St. John the Baptist was a call to the Jews to repent and do penance. St. Mark tells us that this, too, was the theme of the first preaching of our Divine Saviour, 'the kingdom of God is at hand. Repent and believe the gospel' (Mark 1, 15). Moreover, throughout His public ministry, Christ never tired of inducing the chosen people to recognize Him as the Messiah, Who had come upon this earth in fulfilment of the promises made by God to His people through the mouths of the prophets. But the Jews, as we ourselves so often do, thought to apply the message to others and not to themselves. They were too ready to interpret the misfortunes of others as a punishment inflicted by the divine justice for sin, instead of making them an occasion for self-examination and amendment of life. They forgot that though God may punish men by allowing disaster to come upon them, we must not imagine that God always punishes the most guilty in this way. 'Unless you do penance you shall all likewise perish' is the warning of Christ. To confirm this truth He related to His hearers the parable of the barren fig-tree.

A certain owner of a vineyard, following the common practice in Palestine, planted a fig-tree in his vineyard. Normally such a tree would require little or no attention, for the soil would be fertile, rich enough for vines, surely rich enough for a fig-tree. And, indeed, the tree did prosper. It looked healthy, but, despite appearances, it produced no fruit. Each year for three years, the owner searched in vain for a single fig. Consequently he summoned the foreman of the vineyard, explained to him how for three years he had come seeking fruit on the tree and had found none, and so told him to cut the tree down. It was quite useless as it stood there, it occupied space, and, more important, it extracted the nourishment from the soil to produce only leaves, not fruit. The foreman, however, with his innate love for every vine and tree under his care pleaded with the owner to allow the fig-tree one more chance, just one more season. He would undertake to give it special attention. He would dig around it and manure it. If his labours were successful, so much the better, if not, let the master order its removal, and he would cut it down immediately.

Our Divine Saviour undoubtedly intended the parable to convey a

warning to the Jews that the time of their reckoning was fast approaching. Like the fig-tree, they had received ample opportunity to learn what was required of them, and the preaching of Christ was the final grace being offered them by God that they might produce fruit worthy of their call to be His chosen people. At the same time, the parable also expresses a valuable lesson for each one of us.

May we not compare ourselves to the fig-tree. We have been planted in the fertile soil of the Lord's vineyard, the Church. Our soul has been set in the soil of the Catholic Faith, from which it draws the nourishment of divine grace that will enable it to flourish and produce the fruits of good works necessary for salvation. Faith brought us to the baptismal font, there to be cleansed 'by the laver of regeneration' and to be 'reborn of water and the Holy Ghost'. Baptism provided us with the roots, as it were, through which we absorb the nourishment from the other sacraments instituted by Christ. Confirmation gives us the supernatural strength to attain the perfection of spiritual maturity. The energy and power of our interior life is maintained by the 'Bread of life' in the Holy Eucharist. When the disease of sin attacks our soul and threatens to destroy its life, we have the sacrament of Penance to cleanse and heal the wounds. At all times there is the voice of the Church, speaking with the authority of Her divine Founder, to care for and direct our progress. In truth, we are, as the fig-tree, in surroundings ideal for growth and development.

The fig-tree of the parable possessed all the qualities of a perfect tree, and we may easily picture to ourselves the surprise of the owner of the vineyard as he searched in vain among the luxuriant foliage for the fruit. His surprise gradually turned to disappointment. Do we resemble the tree also in this? Does our divine Master search our lives in vain for the fruits of good works? We have the faith; we have had the benefit of the richest nourishment of divine grace, but have we produced the fruit? We are aware of the warning of St. James the Apostle: 'Faith without good works is dead' (2, 26). We know God, we know our relation of dependence upon Him, but do we love Him as we ought? The proof of our love of God, in the words of Christ Himself, is obedience to His commands: 'if any one love me, he will keep my word. And my Father will love him: and we will come to him and will make our abode with him' (John 14, 23). As we look back over our lives we can see the numerous instances of infidelity and failure to co-operate with God's graces. The patience of the owner of the barren fig-tree

certainly does not exceed the patience and mercy shown by God towards us. Many times He might have charged us with being useless and, with preventing other souls, by our actions, from receiving the benefits offered them. Too often our sins affect others, either directly, when they co-operate with us in transgressing God's laws, or indirectly, when their love of God is weakened by the influence of our bad example. By culpably failing to make use of the assistance given us by God, we squander divine grace and render ourselves unprofitable servants.

In the person of the foreman of the vineyard who appeals for a further chance for the barren fig-tree, we may see a figure of the Sacred Heart of our divine Saviour, burning with love for each individual soul. With full knowledge that the heavenly Father of all men wills not the death of the sinner but that he might repent and be saved, the Sacred Heart never ceases to draw men from sin with that same loving kindness that prompted Him to redeem us by His Passion and death upon the Cross. God grant that we may respond to His tender care by the amendment of our lives. Let us express to God our sincere sorrow for our past failures, for the future let us firmly resolve to co-operate with the graces offered us in order that we might produce the fruits of good works, and so avoid the fate of the barren fig-tree of being cut down and cast into the fire.

P. L. MURPHY.

Notes

"Of all the sacred mysteries committed to us by our Lord and Saviour, as unfailing instruments of grace, none is comparable to the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist; and consequently no heavier punishment is to be feared from God than for the EUCHARISTICA unholy and irreligious use, by believers, of that which is full of holiness or rather, which contains the very author and source of holiness. The Apostle wisely saw this, and openly admonished us of it when, after declaring the enormity of their guilt 'who discerned not the body of the Lord,' he immediately added: 'Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep' (I Cor. xi, 29, 30). Therefore, in order that the faithful people, knowing that divine honours are due to this sacrament, may draw abundant fruits of grace from it and escape God's most just anger, pastors shall expound, with the greatest diligence, all things most calculated to show forth its majesty". So did the Catechism of the Council of Trent remind pastors of a grave obligation. (*Cat. C.T., De Euch. Sac.*)

The approach of the National Eucharistic Congress offers a rare opportunity of discharging that pastoral duty. Not, of course, the few and busy days of the Congress itself so much as the six months between now and then, are "the acceptable time" for instructing the ignorant, for better informing the multitude who have only a child's knowledge, and for confirming the faith of all.

*

*

*

*

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

A list of sources of material for sermons and instructions might be useful. Not to mention the regular manuals of theology and commentaries on Sacred Scripture, the following works may be consulted with profit. Those in the English language are not too technical; the rest are mostly standard works.

Pride of place must be given to the *Catechism of the Council of Trent "ad Parochos"*, which the Church intends should be the ordinary promptuary of the preacher. (Cardinal Newman said, "I rarely preach a sermon but I go to this beautiful and complete Catechism to get both my matter and my doctrine".) The Blessed Eucharist occupies a large section (ch. iv) of Part II, *De Sacramentis*.

The *Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent* contain, of course, the highest and most authoritative teaching on the subject, although mainly directed against heresy. See Sessions xiii (D. 874), xxi (D. 930), and xxii (D. 938).

The *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas needs no encomium, and the questions on the Blessed Eucharist (Lxxiii-Lxxxiii), in the *Pars Tertia*, include some of its chief treasures. The *Office of Corpus Christi* (composed by St. Thomas) is a useful source, especially for the Fathers' homilies, the suggestive antiphons, and the Saint's own poems, or hymns.

A handbook of material for preachers was compiled by Fr. Albert Tesnière, of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament, under the title, *Somme de la Predication Eucharistique*, but it does not appear to be in English.

There is an excellent article, *Eucharistie*, by Fr. J. Lebreton, in the *Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique* (tome 1, col. 1548-85), summarising the Scriptural and patristic evidence for the Catholic doctrine on the sacramental and the sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist.

The *Dictionnaire de la Theologie Catholique* devotes, in all, 1664 columns to our subject, distributed over special articles on Scriptural data (Ruch), patristic data (Bareille), ancient monuments (Bour), Theology in 9th to 11th centuries (Vernet), Th. in 12th cent. (de Ghellinck), Th. in 13th to 15th cents. (Mangenot), the Council of Trent (Godefroy), Th. in 16th to 20th cents. (Mangenot), and the Theological doctrine on the accidents (F. Jansen).

On the Real Presence, as proved from Scripture, Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures* are almost a classic, and they are still in print. For an all-round exposition, Bishop Hedley's "*The Holy Eucharist* (Longmans) is hard to beat, although not quite up to date. The Cambridge Summer School (1922) collection of papers, edited by Fr. C. Lattey, S.J., as *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist* (Heffer), contains a sketch of pre-Nicene Patrology, by Dom John Chapman; a history of the Latin Liturgy, in outline, by Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.; a survey of reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, by Canon Freeland; a lucid presentation of the theology of sacrifice, by Fr. M. de la Taille, S.J.; and a statement on the fruits of Holy Communion, by Fr. Jaggar, S.J.

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (Herder), by Fr. Nicholas Gihl, is generally known to ordinands, but less known is the same author's *The Sacraments of the Catholic Church*, which was translated from the German into French, if not into English. I do not know if Chaignon's

The Sacrifice of the Mass Worthily Celebrated (Benziger), an aid to priests themselves, is still obtainable.

They who were interested in Theology a quarter of a century ago, and more, are well aware of the impetus given to the study of the Mass by Fr. de la Taille's monumental *Mysterium Fidei*. Readers of the *A.C. Record* about the year of the first Eucharist Congress in Sydney will remember the special interest shown in that great work by Archbishop Sheehan. A country parish-priest, Archpriest Joseph Carroll, of Wilcannia-Forbes Diocese, had the distinction of both recognising the importance of Fr. de la Taille's work and undertaking its translation. Explanatory and defensive articles by Fr. de la Taille himself were published by Sheed and Ward in the volume, *The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion*.

In what we may call the new era of Eucharistic studies, many books on the Mass appeared in English. *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Burns, Oates), by Abbot Vonier, O.S.B., attractively presented the view that the essence of the Mass was the "mystic immolation", to borrow Billot's favourite term—although many have said much the same in various ways. Fr. M. D'Arcy, S.J., ably restated the relation of the Mass to the Cross, on the lines of de la Taille, in *The Mass and Redemption* (Burns, Oates).

Still another interpretation was given in *The Liturgical Sacrifice of the New Law* (Herder), by Fr. Joseph Kramp, S.J., who not only upheld the tolerable theory that a sacrifice is essentially the offering of a gift of God, but also maintained the very questionable opinion that the bread and wine, as such, enter into the sacrifice. A similar view is found in an otherwise excellent little exposition, *My Mass*, by Fr. J. Putz, S.J.

An easy, edifying statement, suitable for spiritual reading, is *The Meaning of the Mass* (Burns, Oates), by Fr. John Kearney, C.S.Sp. The gist of Fr. Kearney's lesson is expressed in this formula: "The Holy Sacrifice is the Sacred Sign of the subjection and surrender of our soul to God, our Creator and our Father, in union with the subjection of Jesus, who was obedient unto death, by which surrender we open our soul to the gifts of eternal life" (p. 128).

Not to be neglected as a source-book is the Missal, one of the documents of ecclesiastical magisterium to which the *Ecclesia discens* must always look.

NAMES OF THE EUCHARIST.

Names are enlightening, for a well-given name expresses the nature or property of the object, or at least some notable characteristic. The fact that the Eucharist has so many names shows its excellence, for each designates an aspect of something so great as to be inexpressible in one or a few names. To quote again the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Because sacred writers saw the impossibility of signifying the dignity and excellence of this wonderful sacrament in one word, they have tried to do this by using many names" (*De Sacramentis*, iv).

The name *Eucharist* itself has several senses applicable to this sacrament. One meaning is "good grace", and such this sacrament certainly is, for it prefigures eternal life, which is the good grace *per excellentiam*; and, moreover, it contains Him who is the cause of graces. The same name also means "thanksgiving", and this is true of the Mass, in which we thank God for His benefits, especially for the precious gift of sanctifying grace. Lastly, Scripture used the word to describe Christ's act at the Last Supper (*Cat. C.T., ibid.*).

There is a double reason for the name, *Communion*, since—as the Catechism says, quoting St. John Damascene—this sacrament unites us with Christ (the immediate communion) and also with one another (the mediate communion). This unitive effect of the sacrament also accounts for the titles, *Sacrament of Peace* and *Sacrament of Charity* (*Cat. C.T., ibid.*).

Viaticum is a Latin name, meaning, literally provision for a journey (food, money, conveyance, or the like). This sacrament is aptly called the *viaticum*, not only when administered to the dying, but also because it is "our daily bread" that sustains us in our journey through this life (*Cat. C.T., ibid.*).

The *Lord's Supper*, St. Paul called the Eucharistic celebration (I Cor., xi, 20), because it repeats, through the ministry of priests, what Christ did at the Last Supper (*Cat. C.T., ibid.*).

Sacrament and *Sacrifice* are terms too far-reaching for comment in this brief note. They denote two aspects of the Eucharist so joined by Christ that we must not divorce them. The sacrifice of the Mass is a sacrament, and the sacrament never loses its sacrificial character. Even when reserved in the Tabernacle, Christ is a victim, the *Salutaris Hostia*, and the sacrament is well called the *Sacrament of the Altar*.

Another frequent, very accurate, and very comprehensive name is the *Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*.

The hidden realities which the Eucharist represents, contains, or causes, won for it the names, *Holy Mysteries* and *Mystery of Faith*. Because of its essential relation to the mystery of Redemption, it was also called the *Sacrament of our Ransom*.

Our Saviour's promise of the *Bread of Life* and of *Bread of Heaven* was sufficient justification of these beautiful titles. Sometimes, too, it was called simply the *Bread*, for the same reason, or else because of the *materia ex qua* and of the sacramental sign.

The appellation, *Bread of Angels*, does not imply that angels receive this sacrament—for that were impossible—but that we on earth receive, in sacramental guise, Him on whom the blessed angels look with delight (and metaphorically “feed”) in heaven.

Sacrament of Love it is on two counts. First, it is the token of God's love, and of Christ's; and, second, it is the chief means of producing in us love for God and Christ, and for our neighbour.

Amongst other names are *Food of Immortality* (St. John vi), the *Antidote against Sin* (St. Ignatius of Antioch), the *Most Holy Sacrament*, the *Divine Sacrament*, and the *Sacrament of Sacraments*.

Finally, no one will be surprised to hear that a sacrament so rich in names—because so rich in meaning and in blessings—has been called also *sacramentum nominatissimum*, the *Sacrament with many names*.

C. ROBERTS.

Book Reviews

THE THOMISTIC CONCEPT OF JUSTIFYING CONTRITION. Mundelein, 1949. Charles R. Meyer. 236 pages.

At first glance the theology of the act of contrition seems rather simple, but, as Father Meyer shows, a more thorough study of the question in great theologians, St. Thomas, Suarez and St. Bonaventure, reveals difficulties and problems that are bound to be encountered "when the mysteries of the supernatural are joined with the mysteries of the psychological".

In this book, the author presents the thought of St. Thomas on some of the problems, and proposes the solutions of the Angelic Doctor. As a result of an extensive and intensive inquiry, he concludes that the concept of perfect contrition which is common among theologians today is traceable to the Angelic Doctor, in spite of the opinion of some who came to the conclusion that the post-Tridentine concept of the perfection of contrition through the motive of charity was foreign to St. Thomas.

The first four parts of this treatise deal with the essence of contrition—the fifth with acts consequent on the essence; namely, the intention to amend, to confess, to make satisfaction. Part I considers the act in its natural causes, "Psychological Aspects"; parts II, III, IV examine at length the act in its supernatural principles.

Section II contains an admirable treatment of the distinction of virtues, and the specification of acts and operative potencies by their formal objects according to St. Thomas. This leads to an examination of Penance as a virtue, and the conclusion that of its essence contrition belongs to the virtue of Penance, only secondarily to other virtues.

Highlighted in Section III is a study of the mutual causality of contrition and justifying grace—a subtle and controverted question which Fr. Meyer answers with clarity and conviction from St. Thomas and Thomistic principles.

In Section IV, on the Motive of Perfect Contrition, he faces the paradox that an act of true charity as an act of benevolent love requires that there should be no seeking for self, and yet the will as a faculty seeks the perfection of its subject. In other words, all love seems to include self-love, and love of Divine Goodness for Itself seems an impossible motive. He shows that, "The Angelic Doctor neither requires

that the act of perfect contrition be devoid of every consideration of self, nor permits that its motive be any other than perfect love of God in Himself and for Himself". Page 218). Although one seeks his own beatitude in an act of charity, he seeks it only as a good to be referred to God. "Although the beatitude of the subject becomes a real finis of the act of love, it is not the finis ultimus and hence must be considered as material in respect to the finis ultimus, the goodness of God in Himself, which alone is the formal object of the act". (p. 176.)

This dissertation may be too specialized to find a place in the libraries of priests on the mission, but it is a valuable contribution to the theology of contrition and a splendid survey of the mind of St. Thomas on that subject.

J.D.

*

*

*

*

MANUALE PHILOSOPHIAE, by Ioannes Di Napoli. Vols. III & IV. Marietti, 1951. Pages 564 and 200.

Last year we noted the first two volumes of this work (*A.C.R.*, Oct., 1951, page 356). Here, again, the author is to be commended on the clarity of his arrangement and exposition. The third volume opens with Rational Theology and Ethics, and these two treatises complete the course of Scholastic Philosophy as usually found in manuals for the use of students. Our author, however, gives us in the remainder of this volume three subjects that are a welcome addition to such a course, Pedagogy, Aesthetics, and Philosophy of History.

The fourth volume is called a supplement. The first half of it is devoted to a history of philosophy, then follow documents, including the philosophical portions of "Humani Generis", with a commentary; finally, there is a dictionary of philosophic terms. It is a pity that this last volume is so small; the history of philosophy is reduced to little more than a catalogue of names, and the dictionary suffers likewise. In fact, the whole work suffers from being too condensed. If it is to be used with profit by students, it would need a great deal of supplementing. Further, there is hardly sufficient attention given to English philosophy. Finally, every manual treating the whole of philosophy raises the fundamental question whether it is better to use one author through the whole course, or a series of specialist manuals for each subject. The present practice in our various Australian seminaries would suggest that opinion here is almost equally divided on this important matter.

F.A.M.

PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES, Vol. II. June, 1952. St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. 164 pages. Price, 6/- sterling.

We extend a warm welcome to this second annual journal of the Philosophical Society of Maynooth. It is the only publication of its kind in the British Isles, and its authors have wisely considered specially the interests of English-speaking Catholics; accordingly, the books reviewed are almost exclusively English writings or translations. Our welcome is the warmer for the personal reason that this number opens with an article by a young Australian who has already contributed to the *A.C.R.* This and the following article deal with modern, logical philosophies; the third article is on experimental psychology, then come considerations on St. Thomas' proofs of the Existence of God; the final article deals with the influence of Avicenna on Roger Bacon. Half of this number is devoted to reviews of recent books, and here, again, the same breadth of interest is evident. A few Greek words that appear in the text of one of the reviews are so badly printed that any long extract would be difficult reading. Otherwise, the work is well produced and the Philosophical Faculty of Maynooth is to be congratulated on this very fine journal.

F.A.M.

*

*

*

*

FAITH AND MORALS, by T. V. Fleming, S.J., Messenger Office, Melbourne, 1952. 192 pp. Price, 5/6.

No matter into what sphere of life or environment Catholic boys and girls enter when they leave school, sooner or later they are confronted with questions pertaining to their Faith and their Church, about Catholic doctrine on current moral problems, about Catholic social principles. Sometimes, through fear and inexperience they cannot express themselves; more often, through the lack of adequate knowledge they find themselves at a loss to give a confident answer. This book is an attempt, and a successful one at that, to mitigate this deficiency. The author, in a word, had in mind the education of the senior pupils in our schools on certain matters of faith, prevailing moral problems and Catholic social principles.

Under the heading of Faith, the student can learn how to prove the existence of God by the argument from design; God's Nature is treated as also are the Purpose of Creation, the Problem of evil, the Human Soul, Free Will, the Divinity of Christ, the True Church and the Theory

of Evolution. On moral questions, the pupil will learn something of the Moral Law, the sanctity of human life, Euthanasia, lies and secrets, the sanctity of marriage, the evil of contraception. The social discussions comprise the natural duty of the State, the Social order, Communism, Capitalism and Socialism. Each chapter is introduced by a clear and concise exposition of the matter involved; the Catholic doctrine is then explained and defended; finally, objections to our position are presented and answered.

The subjects are interesting; the work is presented in an attractive manner, and rendered easy for both teacher and children to follow. It opens up many new fields of thought and calls upon the student to do some thinking for himself; this in itself is a pleasing feature, for then our children will realize that there is a reasonable defence for most matters of Catholic doctrine. It is to be hoped that a greater knowledge of these questions will bring to boys and girls leaving school a greater appreciation and love of what we as Catholics, too often, have taken for granted, the Truth and Sublimity of our Faith".

P.P.

*

*

*

*

FATHER THURSTON, by J. Crehan, S.J. Sheed & Ward, London, 1952. Price 12/6 in England.

The subject of this book, a "Memoir With a Bibliography", as its author modestly describes it, was, up to his death in 1939, one of the best-known English Catholic writers.

The story of the external element of his life follows a very normal, almost humdrum, pattern. After school days, first at St. Malo in France, later in the two English Jesuit colleges of St. Mary's and Stonyhurst, he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at London, 1874. The usual course followed, classical study, philosophy, teaching, theology, and ordination.

This portion of Fr. Thurston's life is given with reticence. There is little concerning his own spiritual and devotional reactions. Probably he did not think these reactions worth putting on paper. It is an omission not entirely to be deplored. He was noted among his fellow students as addicted to long walking, and already he showed an awakening interest in liturgical and historical questions.

Fr. Thurston was a fellow theologian with Fr. Tyrrell, and they were always good friends. Tyrrell seems to have retained his respect

for Thurston's criticisms and they corresponded frequently up to Tyrrell's death. It is unfortunate that the only letters now available are those from Tyrrell to Thurston, which the latter kept, while the other side of the correspondence seems to have perished. The two friends were very different. Thurston advanced carefully in any work, patiently and thoroughly probing sources before drawing conclusions. Tyrrell, much swayed by moods and personal feelings, confessed: "I hold to my conclusions more firmly than my premises" (p. 51). Several letters of Tyrrell, too long to cite here, give very interesting light on his development. In 1906 his modernist and anti-religious writings, published anonymously, caused him to be dismissed from the Society of Jesus. During his remaining three years of life, Thurston continued to be his friend, and some contact remained. Bright's disease was sapping his strength, and it is suggested, perhaps too, influencing his mental state. Thurston was sent for when the end was approaching in 1909, but was probably out of London at the time, as another Jesuit, Father Pollen, went in his stead. Fr. Crehan states that the friends of Fr. Tyrrell prevented Fr. Pollen from visiting the dying man. On the other hand, Michael de la Bedoyère, in his recent *Life of Baron von Hugel* (p. 232) quotes the Baron as saying that Fr. Pollen "saw Fr. T. for some minutes alone". Conditional absolution was given to Fr. Tyrrell, now unconscious, by Fr. Dessoulavy, a French chaplain at a neighbouring school.

One chapter is entitled "The Counsellor of Souls", and it will hold the interest of priests who so often are asked for advice. Fr. Thurston had great gifts in this work, and many were attracted to him. He described himself, in the early years of the priesthood, as hesitating between this work and the work of writing. His decision was that he could do more for the glory of God by the pen than by giving spiritual direction, and he deliberately withdrew from any extensive contact with souls. Still some letters of direction remain and they will repay study. The principal feature that strikes the reader is that Fr. Thurston did not content himself with the easy method of repeating ready-made spiritual counsels, but went to great trouble to understand the precise difficulty of his enquirer, and to give an answer that would meet his problems in a very personal way.

The Bibliography at the end of the Memoir lists 761 items. There are several full-length books, a completely revised edition of Butler's "Lives of the Saints", many articles in the Catholic Encyclopaedia,

pamphlets, and, above all, articles in Catholic periodicals. For forty-five years the English Jesuit publication, "The Month", rarely appeared without his name. The early writings dealt mainly with historical and liturgical questions. Later on, controversy of all kinds called on him, and in particular he became the great Catholic authority in England on spiritualism and the more unusual psychical and physical phenomena connected with religious persons and questions.

As a controversialist, Fr. Thurston never merely sought to gain a victory over an opponent. He always tried to go to the sources and discover the truth. This at times brought him striking success. Several instances are described in this book. An interesting one concerned Rider Haggard's tale in "Montezuma's Daughter" of the alleged Catholic practice of immuring unfaithful nuns. Thurston challenged Haggard to substantiate the account. The latter claimed that he himself had seen in the Museum of Mexico City the bodies of a woman and child recovered from the walls of a religious building. Thurston then wrote to the Director of the Museum. The reply was that these particular bodies had been brought from the common cemetery of the city, and were on show to illustrate the preserving influence of the climate of Mexico on dead bodies. Finally, Rider Haggard corrected his statement.

Other controversies concerned the Inquisition, Jewish Ritual Murder of Christian Children (which Thurston strongly denied), the English Rite of Coronation. Within the domestic walls of the Church he figured in disputes about the origin of the Rosary, the liquefaction of blood, the Holy House of Loreto, and many other matters.

Particularly in the field of psychical research Fr. Thurston took the stand that, first, stated facts must be examined and proved; next, even though a natural explanation is not apparent, still a praeternatural one is not to be propounded unless natural causes are clearly shown to be insufficient. Thus clairvoyance and telepathy may easily be natural psychic powers of which at present we know very little. This principle is nothing more than that cited with approval by St. Alphonsus Liguori as the common teaching of theologians: "*In dubio presumenda sit aliquis effectus potius provenire a causa naturali quam a superstitione*" (1.3, tr. 1, 20).

Thurston investigated many cases of alleged poltergeists, and propounded a theory that these strange phenomena could be attributed to the irresponsible behaviour of spirits from Limbo. This was described

by Vermeersch (Theol. Mor. II. 247) as "mira hypothesis". It does not seem to have been taken seriously by any writer.

Some of Thurston's best work was concerned with the history of Liturgy. From his schoolboy days he was impressed with the continuity of modern liturgy with earlier times. Again and again he traced our modern practices back through the centuries. He must be credited with a large influence in the growth of interest among English Catholics in liturgical questions.

As a historian his work was principally hagiographical. Again he went to the sources, examined each step critically, and refused to accept as proved anything that could not be fully established by uncontrovertible evidence. The process often meant rejection of popular beliefs and earned him severe criticism from fellow-Catholics, but the veteran Bollandist Fr. Hippolyte Delahaye paid him a very striking tribute in a letter printed by Fr. Crehan. The occasion was the completion of the new edition (1939) of Butler's "Lives of the Saints".

"Le P. Thurston est aujourd'hui incontestablement le savant le mieux au courant de la littérature hagiographique, de toutes les questions qui s'y rattachent et des méthodes les plus sûres de la critique".

He was an excellent religious, a zealous priest. An outstanding characteristic was his readiness to give his time and trouble whenever requested. Those who met him at the London Jesuit residence can never forget his constant readiness to be of service to others.

J.H.

*

*

*

*

BEYOND EAST AND WEST, by John C. H. Wu. Sheed and Ward, London, 1952, pp. 364. 21/- stg.

It is not an everyday privilege to read an autobiography of an Oriental who has a deep knowledge both of his own and Western learning. Add to this autobiography a humble candour that reveals a man who is great both by Eastern and Western standards and who is able to graciously blend these standards together, and you have the person known as John Wu.

John Wu was born in Ningpo in the year 1899. In 1917 he became a convert to Methodism and was an ardent Methodist till 1920, when his interest seemed to wane. In his own words he became more or less a freethinker. Twenty years later he became a Catholic. He said:

"All my life I have been searching for a Mother, and at last I had her in the Catholic Church, and this in a triple sense. God is my Mother, the Church is my Mother, and the Blessed Virgin is my Mother; and these three Mothers have merged into one Motherhood, in which I live, move and have my being". The book traces his life from his childhood down through his fifty years. It shows him as a man who has done a tremendous amount of work and accomplished much in so short a time, and who in the midst of so much occupation was ever mindful and attentive to his parental duties. He is always the Chinese gentleman rising to meet the highest occasions with a simple and effective dignity. He intersperses throughout the book many moral commentaries and conclusions that give much spiritual food for thought. The book leaves the reader with a sense of much gratification. The mantle of greatness has fallen on to a truly great soul who has been able to impart some of the blessings of his greatness to his readers.

The world is much the richer for the publication of this excellent book, and the incalculable amount of good that will follow is known only to the Almighty Himself.

It is a great blessing that many friends brought persistent pressure upon Mr. Wu to write his Autobiography.

A.S.

*

*

*

*

CHRIST IN THE HOME, by Raoul Plus, S.J. (Pustet Co., 1951. 342 pp. \$4.00.)

Coming from the mind of Father Plus, this book has in its title its own recommendation. It is fine; and although we have not seen it in French the fluent English translation seems to have preserved as well as possible the forcible expression of the French author.

French writers of this type of spiritual book have a great advantage over English authors, for in France the roots of literature are in Catholic soil, thus giving any Catholic writer in modern France a whole body of drama and imaginative work from which to take illustrations. When such grist is drawn into a writer's mill his book has a wide appeal. Father Plus moves about with ease among his compatriots, whose failings and aspirations he knows well. Their books, amusements, theatres, are familiar to him; and he can quote as readily from their non-Christian novelists (such as the witty Montherlant) as from Claudel and Péguy using even devils' agents as testimony.

A band round the dust-cover describes it as "the ideal engagement or wedding gift" and as a "spiritual treasure for the Married". Even a grudging reviewer after reading the book accepts these phrasings as statements of fact. Although basically Catholic, it should be of much interest and help to any young person of good will contemplating marriage, and hoping to have "Christ in the home". Anyone who has read other books by Fr. Plus will not need to be told that a deep spirituality informs all his pages. He knows brilliant, attractive young compatriots who build their marriage on a basis of prayer, and he is not afraid to hold up this high ideal to other young people.

The first hundred pages are devoted to the theme, *Marriage*: everything seems to be said in the short meditations which are the medium of the author's advice: "Before Embarking...The Nuptial Liturgy...Life Together is Difficult...Marriage and the Eucharist..." Then, there is the section on the *Home*, followed by the theme, *Training*. Every page is a starting point for prayer and discussion; and it would be of immense help to Australian lay-folk to face well-known truths in a fresh setting. Even those to whom the names of the French authors are unfamiliar will be delighted with the humanity that clothes each homily, and will be enriched by their acquaintance with young Frenchmen and women whose problems are very much like their own.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

PRAYING WHILE YOU WORK, by Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. Burns, Oates, & Washbourne, London, 1951. XIV — 105 pages. 7/6.

When our Lord was in the home at Bethany he made a reply—to a complaint of Martha—which, no doubt, puzzles the modern Martha: "Then her avocation was merely secondary? She could not sanctify herself in pursuing it?" Why, yes, she could, retorts Dom van Zeller, and you can do likewise. God does not intend that all women should choose the part of Mary. He wishes to sanctify those also who choose the part of Martha. This little work is addressed to the women in the world, who, though burdened with the cares of a household, are anxious to serve God seriously and advance in the practice of prayer.

The author proceeds to show how the busy housewife must find God and sanctify herself in her daily work: "The only thing that really matters in life is doing the will of God. Once you are doing the will

of God then everything matters. So if God wills that you should be bowed over the sink in the pantry instead of over the bench in your favourite church, then washing up is for you now the most perfect thing you can possibly do". This aptly summarises the scope of the present work. To effect this, a way of praying is indicated which directs every effort towards God, and a way of directing effort so that everything becomes a prayer. In this section—on prayer—which is extremely practical and clear, the housewife is taught how to sanctify all her activities throughout the day, by means of ejaculatory prayer. All the daily drudgeries are thus directed to the peace and profit of the soul. As a conclusion to the first section of the book, practical advice is offered on planning the day and making religion the driving force of the plan.

We find in the second section of the book a series of prayers which may be used morning and night, at Mass, and for innumerable occasions and difficulties common to domestic life. A virtue of these prayers is that they are intimately interwoven with the first section of the book. They are composed to help the housewife in directing each day to the glory of God.

The knowledge that their cause has been adopted by one so able as Dom van Zeller must cheer the hearts of all our Marthas. They will be well rewarded by a study of this book, which is written in a clear and simple style, enhanced by deft touches of humour; the practical solution offered will certainly introduce a truly Christian light and life to the modern home.

P.F.

*

*

*

*

SAINT PATRICK'S SUMMER, by Marigold Hunt. Sheed & Ward, 1951. 272 pages, 9/- (Eng.).

This must surely be the book that Australian Catholic parents in country districts have prayed for, to help their children acquire more knowledge and an esteem for their Faith. We say, Australian, but town or rural parents in any English-speaking country should welcome it as a treasure. Its setting is England. There is an astonishing amount of sound instruction packed into its interesting pages, with just the seasoning of childish adventures and fantasy to charm any boy or girl. (Perhaps this is the point at which to make a slight criticism of the dialogue: Children ought not to be allowed to use "like" as a conjunction, in, e.g., "like, he did".)

The narrative and technique are excellent, one technical device being the use of vivid scenes, or "showings", given to the children by St. Patrick (or even by Eve and Abraham). Few adults will read unmoved these showings, whether it be in the little scene where Isaac, bound, waits for his father to sacrifice him, or the scene in Elizabethan England where a pursuivant breaks into a house where Mass is being said.

The author brings home skilfully to her readers the truth that the Mass lies at the heart of all persecutions of the Church. A topical "showing" reveals a group at Mass in Russia, and the capture of the priest. This "showing" is linked up with one in the Catacombs and with the one in sixteenth century England. With all this a good course of theology is taught to the two children round whom the story revolves. Adult non-Catholics who are children in their approach to the Faith would be helped by this book, which speaks of Protestants and Jews with great charity.

It is especially a book for teachers and parents to read with their children; and it will be strange if, in the reading, the readers themselves do not experience a deeper appreciation of the history and teaching of the Church.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

IF I BE LIFTED UP. A Passion Play. By Canon J. I. Lane. Burns Oates, London.

This Play about Christ, His works and His sufferings will be a welcome addition to the repertoire of Catholic Dramatic Societies. It will be found especially suitable for representation in Convent Schools. Christ Himself does not appear on the stage, but His Blessed Mother does appear. On this account, as well as on account of the other female characters—Martha and Mary—in a cast of ten, its suitability for Convent Schools will be evident.

The Play is on the whole a robust one; it is often very moving; it drives home the sense of that great word of the Divine Redeemer: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself." Apart from the Prologue and a description of the Crucifixion—both spoken in good blank verse by a Narrator—the dialogue is simple, natural prose. There is, we think, sufficient movement and variety—and, above all, sufficiently strong pull of the emotions to Christ—to relieve all tedium

in a performance lasting an hour and a half. The Play could easily be abbreviated for a less lengthy performance.

A reviewer will feel unwilling to shoot small pedantic criticism at a drama which is so good and so salutary. Perhaps only a few will notice that a well on the road to Hebron is somewhat startling as a localization of scene one. The road to Hebron never figures in the recorded journeys of Christ's public life. The names Abel and Elim are a most improbable choice for two Jewish merchants. There seems to be strong negative evidence that they were not used by Jews as personal names.

We should like to see the Blessed Virgin speaking less, and especially not using so many words at the close of the Play. St. Bernardine's description of Mary's speech: "Few words, but solid", should be the canon for Our Lady in a Play. But here a judicious producer can use his judgment and judiciously emend.

W.L.

*

*

*

*

THE FAITH OF MILLIONS, by Rev. John A. O'Brien. London: W. H. Allen, 1952. 492 pages. (Australian price, 26/6; our copy from Pellegrini and Co.)

This is the British edition of a work that was published in America in 1938. It is one of the most important of Father O'Brien's many excellent, topical books on the Catholic Church. Sufficient evidence of its popularity is the fact that it has passed the three hundred thousand mark and been translated into half a dozen languages. A British edition is most welcome here, because of the difficulty of securing American publications. The book has been written with the non-Catholic in mind, but Catholics also will find it packed with valuable information about the truths that are so often taken for granted. It has a few pages on the conducting of discussion groups, and at the end of each chapter points for discussion and practical applications are added, so that it would make an ideal textbook for such groups.

One of the pleasing features of the work is the use the author makes of diagrams. Thus there is a graph of the growth and continuity of the Catholic Church, a juxtaposition of New Testament practice with that of Catholics and Protestants to-day, a list of the components of the New Testament and their date. There is an abundance of anecdotes to illustrate various doctrines, much in the style of missionaries' stories—perhaps the one about the Notre Dame football coach will bring

a smile; but, on the whole, they are judiciously chosen, and prevent the treatment becoming too heavy.

There are six general headings: the first two are devoted to establishing the Church and its infallible authority, then come the Sacraments, a special part on marriage, a consideration of the Mass and the chief Catholic's devotions; finally, a short treatment of the Commandments.

Each part is well done, and it is safe to predict that this book will be very popular with Australian priests; they will use it themselves and they will recommend it to Catholics and non-Catholics alike as a masterly up-to-the-moment presentation of the Faith.

F.A.M.

*

*

*

*

EACH HOUR REMAINS, by A Carmelite Nun. Sands & Co., 1951. 232 pages. 10/6 (Eng.).

A prospective reader may feel a distaste for hearing the opinions of a contemplative nun on Marx, materialism and cognate subjects, for those are the phrases that sprinkle the first few pages. If you are a reviewer you stiffen your spine and read on, unless you are one of those unregenerate creatures who come within the flick of Sydney Smith's quip: "He doesn't read books; he only reviews them".

But this Carmelite has something to say, and she has a way with her. As we read, we gather that she is English, a fairly young Prioress of a monastery near London, widely educated and experienced before her entrance. Even now she is *au courant* with the most recent Catholic writers, especially in France. Added to her natural gifts is her profound esteem for her vocation as a contemplative. Again and again she makes the point in varied settings that the world needs the contemplative today more than ever. The book is full of hope and common-sense, and should give lay-folk who read it a new regard for the power of prayer—even if only in building up a useful character.

Early in the book the author brings out the idea, which may not be new, but which needs a frequent restatement—the idea that there is danger in the over-organization of even Catholic groups or mass-movements. Such mass-organizations, without very definite *individual sanctification* of the members, merely provide good framework that could be taken over in its entirety by the enemy to function for him, in quite imaginable circumstances; say, in the treachery or default of a leader of a group. The abbé Godin, whom our author frequently quotes, expresses this same fear.

Thinking of a pilgrimage our nun once made to Lough Derg she writes: "Let our Catholic Youth Societies bring some of their members here to face the future...with only God for witness of their thoughts and resolves...Not by tea and cream-cakes, tennis and theatricals, Study Circles and the joy of listening to our own voices, do we attain the meeting of the soul with God...Politics will not give it to us, nor culture, nor sport, nor economics. But it is just possible that three days at Lough Derg might".

In clear-sighted manner there is discussed in one chapter the topical question of the suitability of monastic observance to our new recruits with "their highly-strung, restless yet enthusiastic temperaments". The author's sympathetic humanity does not lead her into the error of wishing to alter the monastic framework built up with wisdom during the centuries, to run up something ramshackle to suit "the passing needs of a fatigued generation".

This chapter is followed by one on St. Therese, "the saint who managed it"—managed to be a contemplative and a Catholic Actionist. The whole book is informed with humour and a sensitive appreciation of the beauties that make the monastery garden such a restful setting for the conversations between the author and good old Sister Imelda, who probably has no existence outside the book; but she does give the author the opportunity of making, impersonally, observations showing deep spiritual insight.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

WE SING WHILE THERE'S VOICE LEFT, by Hubert Van Zeller.
Sheed & Ward, London, 1951. 198 pages, 8/6.

Anyone who has experienced the materialistic atmosphere of modern society knows what a difficult task faces the Christian in practising his religion in such an environment. Because of the difficulty of the battle he needs great strength of faith and skilled advice if he is to escape the whirlpool of the 20th century. For this age, leaving the study of spiritual things to the few, has concentrated the vast preponderance of its efforts on the physical sciences. The unceasing quest for material advancement and pleasure, which are characteristic of modern society, militate against Christian practice.

Consequently the plan of Dom. van Zeller to help the contemporary lay man and woman to live the life of the spirit, according to Gospel precept, is very commendable. This book is the fourth of a series covering Christian life in modern society. Whereas in many contem-

porary works we have the theory of the spiritual life expounded, here the stress is rather on its application in daily life. The aim of the book is to teach the Christian how he must be saved from the world for God: he must reach his destination by using the environment in which he lives and in spite of the obstacles it places in his path. Not content with putting the Christian on the train to eternity, the author reads the signals along the way of life so that he will travel confidently towards God!

A variety of topics is treated, so that the book is a patchwork from life, coloured by personal experiences and anecdotes. Having proved the necessity of religion, the author discusses sin, affection, passion, and the virtues, and shows how true happiness can be attained in the modern environment. Some useful advice is given on marriage and on the preservation of married love: the secure marriage is built on God, and so the necessity of prayer is stressed. Communism is a menace to religion, and the Christian must combat it positively. The value of the liturgy and contemplation—particularly in their social aspects—in rebuilding the spiritual life in our materialistic age, is proved. These are only some of the aspects of religion for the laity which are treated of, but they indicate the usefulness of the book. Each chapter is brief and the subject matter treated of clearly and efficiently; thus a guide is offered to the layman to help him develop his spiritual life. The duty of the Christian in the modern revival is clear; by word and example, by entering into the spirit of the liturgy, he must sing of the important things of life: God, His love and His will. These he must sing while there's voice left!

P.F.

*

*

*

*

General Index

Contents of Volume XXIX.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)	
Annual Day's Prayer for Holy	
Childhood	194
Canons 197, 199, 206-209 and	
Potestas, Dominativa	289
Canon 209, Interpretation of ...	288
Canon 598 § 2, Interpretation of	288
Confirmation, Age for	288

Easter Vigil, Extension of Faculty to celebrate	97
Gabriel, Archangel, Patron of Telecommunication	98
Gide, A., Works condemned	287
Marriage, Manner of writing about	287
Mass, Place for assisting at	288
Matrimonial impediments, Dispensation from	288

Reserved Cases, Absolution from before Easter Communion	43
Rotary Clubs	242
Sisters, Confessions of, in a Church	245
Theft, Grave sin of	237

CANON LAW.

(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll,
P.P., D.C.L.)

Communion, Holy, Unbecoming feminine attire at reception of .	157
Confession of Religious women, Place of hearing	341
Confessor, Ordinary, Convent Chaplain as	57
Confessors, occasional, of Relig- ious women	341
Domicile, Quasi, Acquiring a ...	159
Marriage, Non-Catholics, Con- tracted without valid civil form	58
Marriage, Nullity of by disparity of cult	252
Marriage "extra ecclesiam" be- fore "Ne Temere"	153
Marriage, Mixed, Contracted be- fore witnesses only	56
Marriage of former Anglican Rel- igious	55
Marriage of Non-Catholic con- tracted civilly against rules of sect	153
Marriage, Re-validation of, and religion of children	247
Mixed Religion, Dispensation from, and Catholic upbringing of children already born ...	338
Parish priest in two dioceses ..	337
Religious priest, Exempt, Choice of Confessor	249
Religious, Will of	154
Religious with annual vows re- fused renewal of vows	156
Suspension <i>latae sententiae</i> at- tached by precept	339

LITURGY.

(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)

Altar, Necessity of Crucifix on .	61
Altar, Privileged	344
Candles, Beeswax, Necessity of	346
Divine Praises, Pronunciation of "Blessed"	60
Easter, The restored Vigil of ...	161

McCabe, Bishop Thomas, nomi- nated Bishop of Wollongong .	96
Morel, R., Book of, condemned .	288
Nuns, General Statutes	1
Pincherle, A., Works condemned	287
Pope's exhortation to faithful of Rome (Feb. 10, 1952)	189
Sacred Art, Instruction of Holy Office	283
Sponsa Christi, Instruction of S.C. of Religious on	7
St. Frances Xavier Cabrini appointed patron of emigrants .	196
Wilcannia, Our Lady of Perpetual Succour declared patron of diocese	195
Wollongong, Decree erecting Dio- cese	93

ARTICLES.

Bishop Willson, X, XI, XII, XIII (Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. H. Cullen, V.G.), 20, 117, 205, 305	
Cause of Mother Mary McKillop, The (Rev. W. Keane, S.J.) ..	101
Priestly Perfection (Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. Madden, D.D.)	15
Problem of Concupiscence: A Re- cent Theory of Professor Karl Rahner, The (Rev. J. P. Kenny, S.J.)	290
Sublimity of Fraternal Charity (Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.)	198

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

(Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D.)	
Theology of the Mass, The, VI, VII, VIII (<i>See</i> p. 215), IX, 28, 125, 223, 317	

MORAL THEOLOGY.

(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.)	
Dying, Absolution of the, and purpose of amendment	329
Extreme Unction, Questions about	51
Extreme Unction, Repetition of .	144
Marriage of Minor, Parents' con- sent to	46
"Midnight", Different acceptance of	143
Nuns, Enclosure of	48
Office, Divine, Mental Recitation	150
Religious Services, Co-operation in	331

Forty Hours' Exposition, Questions about	257
Lent, Ferial Mass on first-class feast during	255
Martyrology, Roman, Additions to	348
Mass, Preface of, punctuation of	63
Requiem Mass, Modification of Prayers in	256
Stations of the Cross, Public ...	61

HOMILETICS.

(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)	
Good Shepherd, The	174
Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree, The	350
Parable of the Talents, The	262
Union with Christ	64

NOTES.

Dr. Sheehan's Apologetics, The Third Volume	
(Rev. M. Toal, D.D.)	178
Eucharistica	
(Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.)	353
Theresa Neumann of Konnersreuth (Very Rev. J. Hogan, S.J.)	68
Young Luther, The	
(Very Rev. Mgr. T. Veech)	264

BOOK REVIEWS.

<i>Against the Academies</i> (S. Augustine; Trans. O'Meara)	79
<i>Apologetics for the Pulpit</i> (Roche)	83
<i>Art of Preaching, The</i> (Valentine)	100
<i>Beyond East and West</i> (Wu)	364
<i>Blessed Placide Viel</i>	304
<i>Breaking of Bread, The</i> (Coventry)	80
<i>Case of Therese Neumann, The</i> (Graef)	68
<i>Catholic Book Chronicle: The Story of P. J. Kenedy and Sons</i> (Healy)	124
<i>Catholic Doctor, The</i> (Bonner) .	281
<i>Christ in the Home</i> (Plus)	365
<i>Collected Letters of St. Therese of Lisieux</i> (Ed. Combes)	91
<i>Convent Mirror, The</i> (Haeger)	280
<i>De Sanctissima Trinitate</i> (Ceuppens)	77
<i>Distant Horizons</i> (Flynn)	152
<i>Each Hour Remains</i>	370
<i>Faith and Morals</i> (Fleming) ...	360
<i>Faith of Millions, The</i> (O'Brien)	369

<i>Faith seeks Understanding</i> (Coventry)	90
<i>Father Thurston</i> (Crehan)	361
<i>Four Years Struggle of the Church in Hungary</i> (Mindszenty)	85
<i>Gospel in Slow Motion, The</i> (Knox)	185
<i>Grammatica della lingua Ebraica</i> (Carrozini)	177
<i>Holy Week</i>	186
<i>How to meditate on the Rosary</i>	188
<i>If I be lifted up</i> (Lane)	368
<i>In the service of Youth</i> (Hoesl)	84
<i>Manuale Philosophiae, III, IV</i> (Di Napoli)	359
<i>Marriage and Nuptial Mass</i> (O'Connor)	214
<i>Moral and Pastoral Theology: A Summary</i> (Davis)	271
<i>Nazarine, The</i> (Luddy)	87
<i>On Darlinghurst Hill</i> (O'Brien)	273
<i>Patrology, Vol. I</i> (Quasten) ...	78
<i>Philosophical Studies, Vol. II</i> .	360
<i>Poems</i> (Stuart)	336
<i>Prayer in Faith</i>	336
<i>Praying while you Work</i> (Van Zeller)	366
<i>Queen's Daughters, The</i> (Martindale)	274
<i>Questiones selectae ex epistudis S. Pauli</i> (Ceuppens)	272
<i>Reproachfully Yours</i> (Hasley) .	261
<i>Return to Chesterton</i> (Ward) ..	186
<i>Saints in Pictures, The</i> (Ward)	82
<i>Seven Deadly Virtues, The</i> (Basset)	142
<i>Sin of Adam in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas</i> (Fitzpatrick)	42
<i>Storm of Glory</i> (Beevers)	88
<i>St. Peter Damian</i> (Blum)	87
<i>St. Joseph's Parish, Temuka</i> (Cahill)	316
<i>St. Patrick's Summer</i> (Hunt) .	367
<i>Surrender to the Spirit</i> (Surles)	277
<i>Synthesis of Sacrifice according to S. Augustine</i>	279
<i>Theologia Biblica De Incarnatione</i> (Ceuppens)	276
<i>Thomistic Concept of Justifying Contrition</i> (Meyer)	358
<i>Unless some man show me</i> (Jones)	184
<i>We sing while there's voice left</i> (Van Zeller)	371
<i>Whither and Why</i>	160